DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 691 HE 004 722

AUTHOR	Jameson, Barbara B.
TITLE	Project Right Start.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. University Urban Interface Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Higher Education Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0725
PUB DATE	Jun 73
GRANT	OEG-29-480725-1027
NOTE	98p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Early Childhood Education; *Higher Education; Psychological Services; *School Community Relationship; *University Extension; Urban Areas; *Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

The University-Urban Interface Program (UUIP) is a federally-funded project to study an urban university's community relations efforts and innovations, their successes and failures. This is a study of one of the UUIP areas of priority, Project Right Start, a plan for creating a facility for the detection and treatment of psychological problems in infants and young children. The report is divided into 3 parts: (1) a description of Project Right Start; (2) a history of the development of Project Right Start; and (3) an analysis of an interface between the university, the community, and a target agency. Part I describes the program of Project Right Start and the general characteristics of the population it is serving. Part II highlights events occurring in the university, the community, and in Project Right Start. Three charts at the end OF Part II summarize the history of the project from 1967-1972. A glossary gives the full name and a brief description of agencies relevant to the development of Project Right Start. Part II approaches the development of Project Right Start from a sociological perspective, using the Institution-Building model as the framework for the analysis. Appendices include the organization and structure of the University of Pittsburgh, the use of the Institution-Building Model for UUIP research, the members of the research advisory council, and a list of the other reports published by the UUIP. (Author/PG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE 50
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED 082691

PROJECT RIGHT START

UNIVERSITY-URBAN INTERFACE PROGRAM

CONTRACT NO. OEG-29-480725-1027

PROJECT NO. 80725

SUBMITTED TO THE

BUREAU OF RESEARCH U.S.O.E.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

JUNE, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 722

ED 082691

PROJECT RIGHT START

By

Barbara B. Jameson

Research Assistants
Mark Anderson
Christina Jarema

PRS Liaison
Charles Williamson

June, 1973

This paper was prepared under the auspices of the University-Urban Interface Program; Principal Investigator, Albert C. Van Dusen, Secretary of the University; Director, Robert C. Brictson.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the many people whose cooperation made this report possible. Chris Jarema and Mark Anderson made many interviews and tracked down memos, reports, and statistics. Chuck Williamson and other members of the Right Start staff kept us informed on activities and facilitated the research. Members of the Organization for Taking Care of Business graciously gave interviews, membership information, and provided general input from a community point of view. Drs. Golin and Willis of the Psychology Department provided data and insights concerning the early phases in planning for a community psychology facility. The UUIP staff read the many versions of this report and gave generously of their help. Linda Wykoff typed the copy, including the charts. And last, but not least, Dr. Jerome Taylor gave many hours of interview throughout the three years and provided an interesting project to study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PART I: A Description of Project Right Start	5
PART II: A History of the Development of Project Right Start	11
Summary Chronicle Charts	36
Glossary	40
PART III: An Analysis of the Interface Between the University and Community Through Project Right Start	43

APPENDICES

The University-Urban Interface Program (UUIP) is a federally-funded project to study an urban university's community relations efforts and innovations, their successes and failures. Emphasis is on research on action programs, not on actual operations. UUIP focuses on five priority areas as follows:

(1) Minority and Community Services

(2) Campus Development

(3) Communications

(4) Long-Range Pittsburgh Goals

(5) University Governance

UUIP activity within the first priority concentrates on four projects which have been labeled Operation Outreach. This is a study of one of those Outreach efforts--Project Right Start.

One of the major tasks of the University-Urban Interface research team has been to study a university in its response to change. One of the changes demanded by people both within and outside of the University is that the University rethink its relationship to the rest of society. Their position is that the University as a center of knowledge and training should more directly share its resources with the community. The pressure has been particularly strong in the area of the needs of the disadvantaged of our society that often reside near the campuses of our urban universities.

The project reported here is an example of an attempt by an urban university and people in a nearby poverty area to come together to solve a problem. Within the University are those with the knowledge and skills in the field of child development. Within the community are new lives which face tragedy unless some of these skills are brought to bear on them. A

modern systems analyst would look at the situation and come up with a detailed plan for matching the needed function with available resources and perhaps, if he were new in the field, smile at the simplicity of the solution. The more sophisticated, or at least more seasoned, analyst would recognize that the social organization of any planned innovation is embedded in a much larger social system, which is comprised of many smaller social systems.

Our study focuses on two large amorphous social systems, the University and the urban community. Both systems need to meet changes in order to survive. Higher education has moved into a position where its survival is dependent on wide-ranged public support. At a time when universities have become more dependent on public money, they have come under moral attack by large segments of the population. At the same time, the expectations of those in urban areas have been raised far beyond the present reality. Within both systems, there are people committed to making innovative changes to alleviate the stresses in these systems. Project Right Start represents an interface between these two larger systems. Project Right Start is an attempt to not only solve some explicit problems in one area of concern, that of the development of the child in a poverty area, but to move toward the institutionalization of useful relations between the University and its urban community.

One of our reasons for using a case study approach is to look in depth at the events that occur between the conception of a widely accepted plan (such as helping little children) and the implementation of the plan (Project Right Start). To aid this case study, the institution-building

framework has been employed.[1] This approach calls for the organization of data around six basic variables--goals, programs, leadership, personnel, resources, and internal structure, plus various types of linkages to the focused-upon organization. This approach assumes that these are basic ingredients to the institutionalization of an organization or a set of ideas. These variables are viewed in terms of three separate mappings--the normative, the actual, and the images people have of the plans and operations. Since this framework has been carried over into all areas of UUIP research, the hope is to have some common bases to tie together the many separate projects of the interface research.

As one begins to pull together the many pieces of a case study, an acute difficulty with the approach becomes painfully apparent. At just what point does the researcher decide there is enough "relevant" data to "close" the case and render an interpretation. Many who read this report will be aware of many more facts that might have been included. This is not an apology but rather a recognition that the boundaries of a case study are not limited by the questions asked, as in the case of survey research. Therefore, the case study becomes somewhat of an "image mapping" of a researcher, but a researcher who has had access to memos, proposals, minutes, and interviews of a wide variety of persons. Added to this is the element of participant observation that allows one to experience some of the frustrations and cross pressures of those involved.

This report attempts to capture the experiences involved in developing Project Right Start. Such a project is of especial interest to the University at this time because it provides an opportunity to observe, chronicle, and evaluate a concrete example of one stated goal of the University-Urban

---

[1] See Appendix A.

Interface: the goal of learning how a university and its urban community can share their resources and work together for a healthy community. This report is one in a series which will attempt to assess the processes and social arrangements which contribute to or hinder university-community interaction.

The report is divided into three parts:

Part I - A Description of Project Right Start

Part II - A History of the Development of Project Right Start

Part III - An Analysis of an Interface between the University, the Community, and a Target Agency

Part I describes the program of Project Right Start and the general characteristics of the population it is serving. Part II highlights events occurring in the University, in the community, and in Project Right Start. This chronicle of events begins with the year 1967, when activities relevant to Project Right Start were taking place, although Right Start itself was not begun until 1969.

Three charts at the end of Part II (pages 36-38) summarize the history of this project from 1967-1972. A Glossary on pages 40-41 gives the full name and a brief description of agencies relevant to the development of Project Right Start.

Part III approaches the development of Project Right Start from a sociological perspective, using the Institution-Building model as the framework for the analysis.

PART I

A DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT RIGHT START

A Description of Project Right Start

Project Right Start is a plan for creating a facility for the detection and treatment of psychological problems in infants and young children. It is a project that brings together in a close working relationship the members of a university Psychology Department and a group of parents from a poverty area. It is based on the philosophy that if parents and specially trained personnel can work together, many children can be spared the problems that lead to academic failure, juvenile delinquency, mental retardation and psychosis. It has been named "Right Start" to express that philosophy.

The Merging of Academic Knowledge with Specific Community Problems

During the last decade, there has been a great deal of discussion as to how to close the gap between middle-class America and the economically and educationally deprived. Such programs as Head Start seek means to acquaint children from poverty areas with the tools that help children when they enter the public schools. It has been well established however, that many problems are well developed during the first year of life or are even present at birth. For example,[2] "the self-esteem of children is shaped importantly during the first year of life; an infant's response to stress is influenced by the nature of his relationship to his parents or other caretakers; the development of deductive logic in the 18-20 month old infant depends on his prior relationships with these caretakers; self-determination and self-direction begin to develop as

---

[2] This material is quoted or paraphrased from "A Proposal to United Family Services, Inc.," Jerome Taylor, Ph.D., July 15, 1971.

early as six months; suspicion and distrust begin to take shape during the first year; initiative and achievement orientation begin during the second year; and moral judgment takes an important developmental turn during the second and third years."

Not only has it been established that these first three years are extremely formative, but there also exists the understanding and technical means to detect signs which predict a wide range of behavioral problems.[3] Added to this are the present advances in detection and alleviation of forms of functional retardation. Not only has research developed observational signs of socially or physically induced behavioral problems, but also remedial approaches for the treatment of these problems.[4]

By bringing together those with the knowledge and skills in the area of child development and those in direct contact with children who would benefit from knowledge, much needless suffering might be avoided. This is the purpose of Project Right Start.

The project is working toward developing a center which would facilitate this interaction. Such a facility would concentrate its efforts in an area of the city known as the Hill District. It would work in cooperation with other agencies concerned with infants and young children. Before describing more specifically what such a facility might entail, let us look more closely at the community which Project Right Start will service.

The Hill District

The major area served by Project Right Start is a neighbor of the University. The area falls within the poverty designation criteria of the

---

[3] Jerome Taylor, Memo to Mellon Foundation, (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh, Psychology Department, May 29, 1970).

[4] Bibliography, May 25, 1971--Includes basic and applied articles concerned with component variables and appropriate change strategies.

U. S. government. The Hill is predominantly Black (91.3%). It is highly residential, most homes being fairly old, but there are some new low-income housing units. There are many small shops and other neighborhood facilities in the area. Several enclaves of ethnic and black subcommunities have strong attachments to the area, many families having lived there for several generations. Interspersed within the neighborhood are boarding houses and bars that bring a more transient and often crime-prone element to the area.

In 1967, the Department of Labor estimated that a moderate standard of living for a family of four in Pittsburgh required $8,400.[5] The Hill District median income was $3,340, and 85% of the household heads earned less than $7,000. The unemployment rate of the Hill District was the highest in Pittsburgh in 1967; 14.3% against a 4.8% rate for the whole city. A high percentage of those employed are classified in the "structural" category, that is, machine trades, construction and excavation, jobs which are subject to seasonal recessions. The Hill can also be characterized as having a high percentage of households headed by females (37.3%) and having many retireer (21.7%).

Although the majority of jobs held in the Hill are in the "blue collar" category, 5.6% of the household heads were listed as professional or technical, which includes ministers, nurses, social workers, teachers, and students. Many of these provided the leadership to form citizens' groups to work for a higher quality of living for the community.

---

[5] A. Smith, "The Demand for Transportation in Pittsburgh's Model Neighborhood," 1967. This publication has a more intensive profile of the areas. Much of Smith's data was taken from Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission's "Home Interview Survey," 1967.

As Described by 1970 Census Data*

Population by Race

	N	%
Total Black:	25,426	91.3
Total White:	2,411	8.7
Total Population:	27,837	100.0

Count of Families by Head of Household

	N	%
Husband-Wife	3,644	57.5
Male Only	335	5.3
Female Only	2,364	37.2
Total Families:	6,343	100.0

Age by Race and Sex

	White Males		White Females		Non-White Males		Non-White Females	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 5	43	3.9	38	2.9	886	7.5	924	6.8
5-14	85	7.7	78	6.0	2,263	19.1	2,178	16.0
15-24	122	11.0	192	14.7	1,686	14.2	1,905	14.0
25-34	120	10.8	215	16.5	959	8.1	1,275	9.4
35-44	124	11.2	132	10.1	1,118	9.4	1,647	12.1
45-54	197	17.8	167	12.8	1,508	12.7	1,937	14.3
55-64	204	18.4	208	16.0	1,523	12.8	1,694	12.5
65+	213	19.2	273	21.7	1,912	16.1	2,011	14.8
Total:	1,108		1,303		11,855		13,571	

Count of Housing Units by Occupancy/Race of Head

Total Owner Occupied	2,458
White Owner Occupied	246
Negro Owner Occupied	2,194
Total Renter Occupied	8,379
White Renter Occupied	686
Negro Renter Occupied	7,654

Type of Structure (Count)

	N	%
1 Unit	3,700	30.4
2+ Units	8,463	69.6

*Hill District tracts for 1970 include: 301, 302, 303, 304, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 508, 509.

THE HILL DISTRICT

As Described by A. Smith, 1967

Employment Status of Household Heads (1967)

	N	%
Full-time	4,844	43.3
Part-time	347	3.1
Housewife (Non-worker)	1,955	17.4
Housewife (Part-time)	27	0.2
Retired	2,438	21.7
Unemployed	1,606	14.3
Total:	11,217	100.0

Distribution of Hill District Family Income

	N	%
Less than $3000	4,796	42.8
$3,000 - $4,999	2,784	24.8
$5,000 - $6,999	1,981	17.7
$7,000 - $9,999	1,015	9.0
$10,000 +	641	5.7

Median Income: $3,340

Distribution of Occupational Skills of Hill District Residents Employed on a Full-Time Basis

	N	%
Professional, Technical	271	5.6
Clerical, Sales	504	10.4
Service	1,192	24.6
Processing	34	0.7
Machine Trades	145	3.0
Benchwork	72	1.5
Structural Work	1,090	22.5
Miscellaneous	344	7.1
No Answer	1,192	24.6
Total:	4,844	100.0

Plans for the Center

Specific plans for the center have varied somewhat, depending upon the extent of the geographic area considered for service and the emphasis of a particular funding unit. For example, in a proposal to Model Cities in December, 1970, the plans called for physical facilities to service at least 50 children a day in the Right Start component.[6]

Although the plans remain flexible, the general outline of operation laid out in the December, 1970 proposal remains the same. That plan suggests that when a parent and child first come to the center, a background interview will be conducted, the family would then be assigned to a "generalist," a paraprofessional who has been broadly and intensively trained in a range of assessment procedures and intervention techniques. The family may continue to work with this generalist throughout their contact with the center or with a "specialist," a paraprofessional who has been trained to work within a highly selective problem area. A variety of professional expertise will also be available. The efforts of these professionals and paraprofessionals will be organized around six areas of functional assessment and intervention as follows:

1. Emotional Development
2. Social Interaction
3. Learning and Attention
4. Cognitive Processes
5. Physiological Orientation
6. Community Involvement

Within each of these areas, specific kinds of assessment instruments will be used to assess the development of the child and the parent-child relation-

---

[6] Jerome Taylor, Proposal to Model Cities for Psychology Center for Primary Prevention, December 28, 1970. (At the time of this proposal, it was thought that South Oakland, the area continuous to the University, would be in the service area.)

ship. As the center is developed, plans call for the acquisition of more technological equipment in order to more precisely test the children and to add to the body of knowledge of child development. Another important aspect of the center will be the organizing of community rap sessions with parents and teenagers around issues of child development.

A great deal of the energy expended during the planning phases of the center has been in laying a firm foundation for the center itself and for its acceptance by the community. The psychologists have listened to the parents describe their problems and have formulated a program based on psychological theory and techniques. A great deal of thought has gone into making use of community resources, especially community personnel, in both the development of the plans and in utilization in roles within the center.

The next section relates some of the important events which effected the interaction between the University and the urban community as they both worked toward the development of the "target agency" -- Project Right Start.

PART II

A HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT RIGHT START

A History of the Development of Project Right Start

1967

The chronicle of Project Right Start begins with 1967. In that year, events occurred in both the urban community and the University which are relevant to our story. One, the Hill Team was established, which focused its attention on ways to grapple with mental health problems in the Hill District. Two, the new Chancellor, in a speech to a community group, committed the University to an involvement in the solving of urban problems.

The Urban Community

In 1965, a Comprehensive Mental Health Plan was passed in Pennsylvania. Under this plan, the city of Pittsburgh was divided into catchment areas, each one served by a major medical facility. Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic,[7] associated with the University of Pittsburgh, was chosen to serve essentially the center of the city, which includes the Hill District and Oakland. The County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center began operation in September of 1967. The center is divided into five "teams" each one serving within a specific geographical boundary within the catchment area. A team is composed of about 12 people--psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, social workers, and community workers.[8] The team that served the Hill District brought together mental health specialists with community people and became a major nucleus of concerned people who were beginning to attain a wider knowledge of problems specific to the Hill

---

[7] Commonly abbreviated WPIC. This and other related agencies are described in the Glossary on page 40.

[8] From a brochure of the Hill Team from the County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center of Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, University of Pittsburgh, no date.

and skill in problem solutions. People on this team became a major force in the development of what was eventually to lead to Project Right Start.

The University

In June of 1967, the then-new Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, Dr. Wesley W. Posvar, addressed the annual dinner of N.E.E.D. (Negro Educational Emergency Drive).[9] In this speech he laid out his position as to the relation between the University and the city. Posvar stated that Pitt was fortunate to be situated in an urban center because a major focus of higher education in the future will be the study of urban life. But, he added, the University must not only learn from the city, and give training in the needed skills, but must also "offer its skills and resources in active public service." With this speech and subsequent words and actions, the Chancellor has made it clear that the University of Pittsburgh is seeking ways to interact actively with the urban community.

Summary

By the end of 1967, the prerequisites for an active interface between the Hill District and the University in meeting the problems of emotional and social health of the community had been met. One, at the highest level of University administration a commitment had been made to actively involve University resources in community-based programs, and two, a group of community people and community-oriented professionals were gaining experience in community mental health problems and becoming sensitized to areas of crucial public need.

---

[9] Wesley W. Posvar, Ph.D., "The University and the City: An Entering View of Pitt and Pittsburgh," remarks to the Annual Dinner of N.E.E.D., June 12, 1967.

1968

On April 4, 1968 Martin Luther King was assassinated. As black people in the Hill District emerged from the shock of this tragedy and the riots which followed, there was a recognition that the time for discussion was over and actions must be taken to really begin to tackle the problems that crippled the black man and the poverty-ridden areas so many of them lived in.

The Urban Community

One of the crippling effects of racism and poverty is low self-esteem. In 1965, a young black teacher of a predominantly black Pittsburgh high school had incorporated more Afro-American history in his classes.[10] The curriculum change had a positive effect on his students and he decided it was time to reach beyond his classroom to others in the community. The teacher turned to the nearby university for aid in planning some research to better understand the relation between the learning of Afro-American history and the self-esteem of the young black person. Through the guidance of the Chairman of the Clinical Psychology Program, a plan was worked out to investigate two questions:

(1) To what estent could community resources be mobilized in support of a project aimed at enhancing the self-esteem of black children?

(2) What effects would such a project have on the self-esteem of the children who participate in it?[11]

---

[10] Eugene Davis, An Examination of an Administrative Model for Planning Urban University-Community Interface Programs, Ph.D. Dissertation (unpublished), University of Pittsburgh, 1971, p. 21.

[11] Ibid., p. 22.

The participants in Project Self-Esteem went to various agencies in the Hill District to elicit their opinions and support. After receiving monies from public and private funding agencies, a staff was hired and the teacher became the Program Director of the project. A pilot program was conducted in the Summer of 1968 as part of the YMCA summer program. The evaluation of this summer program suggested that curriculum in black art, music, and dance was more effective than a traditional history approach. The control of the content and conduct of the project remained in the community and the University staff was responsible for the research aspects.[12] In the Fall of 1968, students from the University Black Action Society were trained as research testers and another link between the University and the Hill District was established. Three public schools were chosen in which to try out the new curriculum and by the end of the first year, black ethnic pride had been heightened to a point whereby the children in the project participated in the Annual Pittsburgh Folk Festival, a first in the long history of that festival. The experience of this project and the particular personnel involved in it are directly related to the birth of Project Right Start as will become evident in the following pages.

The University

Within the University, several steps were taken to formalize the University's commitment to interaction with the urban community and to the eradication of racial injustice. In January, the University Council on Urban Problems was formed. The Black Action Society was organized in April, and in June the University-Community Educational Programs (U-CEP) which included a black scholarship program was inaugurated. Most relevant

---

[12] Sanford Golin, Eugene Davis, et. al., "Psychology in the Community: Project Self-Esteem," Psychological Reports, XXVI (1970).

to our chronicle, however, are events occurring within the Psychology Department and in the office of the Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs.

In June, Chancellor Posvar sent a memo to all departments requesting an inventory of service programs and proposals for projects to eradicate racial injustice.[13] This memo reached the desk of the Chairman of the Clinical Psychology Program who had been working in the "self-esteem" project described above. He had been thinking about an extension of the Clinical Psychology Program which might be located in the Hill District. He formalized his thinking in a proposal for a center to provide psychological services to children and their families.[14] This center could also provide field experience for graduate students and paraprofessionals. The proposal was sent to the Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs who was coordinating the review of all proposals that were offered in response to the Chancellor's memo. The Psychology Extension Center proposal was chosen from among the approximately one hundred proposals received and was eventually funded for $30,000 by a block grant donated by several private foundations.[15]

In the meantime, the Chairman of the Clinical Psychology Program had encouraged the department to invite Dr. Jerome Taylor, a black clinical psychologist, as a candidate for a department position which would have a community orientation. At that time, Taylor was the administrator of a

---

[13]Wesley W. Posvar, "Memo to All Deans and Directors," University of Pittsburgh, June 12, 1968.

[14]Sanford Golin, "Report on Hill District Extension of the Clinical Psychology Center," a memo to A. C. Van Dusen, Vice Chancellor for Program Development and Public Affairs, May 12, 1969 (for Mellon Foundation Report from the University of Pittsburgh).

[15]Ibid.

child mental health program in the Midwest. In July, Dr. Taylor met with department staff and people in the community. The Program Director of the self-esteem project was especially active in arranging meetings to acquaint Taylor with concerned people in the community. Because of a University-wide hiring freeze, it was nine months before the University was able to offer a position to Taylor. However, an exchange of letters ensued in which the black psychologist laid out many ideas which were incorporated into the planning of a proposal for a psychology extension center.

In the Spring of 1968, a proposal was submitted to the United States Office of Education for a University-Urban Interface Program.[16] Ideas for some kind of Office of Urban Community Services had been discussed from "should we" to "how to" and such an office was incorporated in the Interface proposal.[17] Although it would be a year before either the University-Urban Interface Program (UUIP) or an Office of Urban Community Services (OUCS) were implemented, the University had taken another step to activate its commitment to seeking new ways to interact with the community to solve urban problems.

Summary

By the end of 1968, national events had made it imperative that problems of the black community be given top priority in concerted effort by all segments of the social system, including higher education. The University of Pittsburgh responded by innovating new programs and seeking monies and other resources to implement them.

---

[16] A. C. Van Dusen, "Proposal to Develop a Program of University-Urban Interface," mimeographed, Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh, April 1, 1968.

[17] The history of UUIP and its programs have been told elsewhere and will not be repeated here.

1968 saw the beginnings of programs to relate the University to urban problems and blacks themselves were taking an active part in the process. Steps had also been taken to obtain federal money to support both action and research of action in the form of some kind of University-Urban Interface Program. At the same time, local private foundations had granted money to explore the possibilities of extending the work of the Psychology Department into the Hill District to reach young children and their parents in their own neighborhood. Contact with Dr. Taylor had been made and the two major leaders of the self-esteem project had been active in encouraging the eventual director of Project Right Start to come to Pittsburgh.

1969

This year marks a period when some of the plans that were proposed were actually put into operation. Personnel were hired specifically to carry out some of the programs, including Project Right Start. By the end of the year, direct community input began flowing into the plans for a Right Start program.

The University

In January of 1969, a group of faculty and graduate students of the Psychology Department formed the Racial Justice Committee. Their goal was to formulate some kind of a policy statement to encourage the Department to recruit more black faculty and students. Members of the committee also discussed ways in which the Department could further develop its reach into the community. In March, a memo from the Chancellor asked all departments to specify their plans for recruiting minority group personnel. The work of the Racial Justice Committee was formalized by the Psychology Department

and by the summer, a document was endorsed by the Department to recruit more black faculty and graduate students. A major problem was money to implement the goal, as the University was in the midst of a major financial crisis. The Chairman of the Clinical Psychology Program who had also chaired the Racial Justice Committee, pushed for the hiring of the black psychologist and was able to accomplish it, but only by using money from the grant for the extension center and additional resources from WPIC.[18] The appointment was made in May; and by July, Taylor arrived on campus and became Director of the Psychology Department Extension Center (later called Project Right Start).

This was also the same month that the Office of Urban Community Services (OUCS) officially went into operation with its new director. The black high school teacher who was the program director of the self-esteem project and was now working on a doctorate, moved over to OUCS. This gave the newly-hired psychologist a valuable friend who was in the middle of the University effort to coordinate and initiate programs in the minority group area. By November, 1969, the Office of Education had accepted the University-Urban Interface proposal, which was to act as a research arm in several priority areas of University-community interactions.[19]

The Urban Community

During the Summer of 1969, members of the Hill Team working out of WPIC began having weekly meetings to discuss special problems of the Hill District. A graduate students working at WPIC became particularly upset at the lack of services in the Hill District. Through his initiative and

---

[18]The Director of Project Right Start, in a recent interview, commented that he probably would not have accepted the offer if he had realized that he was to be paid by "soft money". By 1970 his salary was paid by "hard money" from the department's budget.

[19]Van Dusen, op. cit.

the help of two community people on the Hill Team, a group of concerned mothers was brought together to talk about the problems and to decide how to go about solving them. An ad hoc committee was formed, bringing together high level representatives from the Board of Education, Child Welfare, and other agencies to exchange information with each other and with the mothers. Dr. Taylor became a member of this ad hoc committee, and when the graduate student returned to the Fall course work, Taylor became chairman of the committee. As chairman of this group, he developed community contacts and learned about child and family services available in the Hill District. Surveys were taken by the Hill Team to more clearly define the service needs. Although the purposes of the ad hoc committee were fulfilled by Fall, the bringing together of concerned parents was just a beginning. The members of the Hill Team who had organized the effort to form a coalition of concerned mothers continued the process; and by early the next year, the group officially named itself Taking Care of Business (TCB). Taylor stayed in the background while this group was forming. His philosophy was that community groups must develop their own leadership and work out their own programs before turning to "experts", upon whom they might depend too early in the group formation process.

Summary

By the end of 1969, the problems of bringing up children in the Hill District were being clearly articulated, and groups within both the University and community were focusing their energies on how to use resources to help families with the problems they faced.

1970

This year is marked by the putting to paper of the many ideas that had been talked about the year before, and by the seeking out of ways to turn those ideas into reality.

The Urban Community

In January, the group of concerned mothers who had been meeting in the Hill District invited the director of the Psychology program to meet with them. Taylor, later describing this and subsequent meetings, wrote:

> In talking with and listening to people from the community, those groups organized and unorganized, some ideas regarding the appropriate structure and extension of our Hill Psychology Center have begun to emerge. People are concerned about their young people, their very young, those ranging in age from infancy to pre-school and through elementary school age. In listening, e.g., to the group of mothers, example after example was given of behavioral problems and problems of mental and educational retardation which, if they had been detected and worked with early enough, could have saved many parents, relatives, and caretakers much agony and the child much needless suffering.[20]

A general agreement emerged that the problem they wanted to focus on was the inadequate mental health service for infants and very young children. The director met with them several times during the winter, and together they decided they wanted a program by which the University and the community group could work together to develop a center to service these needs. In March, the group named itself TCB. The membership of TCB had grown from a half dozen mothers to about 20 mothers and fathers. Some of the mothers were full-time housewives, but most of the

---

[20]Jerome Taylor, "Proposal to Model Cities-Pittsburgh for a Hill District Psychology Center for Primary Prevention," October 30, 1970.

parents were also working as teachers, social workers, or in health-related fields.

In March and April of 1970, TCB and the director worked together to draft plans and write proposals for the establishment of a "Primary Prevention Center."[21]

By the end of 1970, TCB had drafted a charter of incorporation and had given serious thought to the need for business and administrative skills necessary to operate a center.

Project Right Start, Submitting a Proposal

By April of 1970, the goals of Project Right Start had been spelled out and needed facilities and personnel specified. Taylor was officially named Director of the project. A search of possible funding sources first led to a review of several federal programs in the area of mental health care. The drawback to federal funding was the time required to research and write the very technical proposal demanded by the complex requirements of such agencies as the National Institute of Mental Health. The director turned to the Office of Urban Community Services for advice on local funding sources. It was decided to first submit the proposal to the Falk Foundation. That foundation, however, was not putting its funds into early child development at that time, and the request for Project Right Start funds was turned down.

This rejection was but a temporary setback to the project. OUCS informed the director that Model Cities of Pittsburgh would be interested in proposals dealing with child care. This had several implications for Project Right Start. First, the goals of the primary prevention center,

---

[21] In the Spring of 1970 the official name of the project was the Hill District Psychology Center for Primary Prevention. South Oakland was included in later proposals, and in 1971 it was renamed "Project Right Start," (page 27 of this report).

Project Right Start, would have to be rewritten to include the child care dimension as required by Model Cities. This was easily done, in that early detection of mental problems in children ranging from one year to five years in age could be considered, in broad terms, as meeting child care requirements. Also, the facilities that were planned for the center would be expanded to include play and learning areas for young children, relevant to observation techniques for spotting psychological, emotional or learning problems of children.

Second, the geographic scope of the primary prevention center had to be enlarged to take in the Model Cities boundary which included not only the Hill District, but also the area of South Oakland. This had implications for the size of facilities needed to handle the number of children in the enlarged geographical area as well as implications regarding the number of staff that would be required to provide services for a larger number of children. The proposal submitted to Model Cities[22] was for $600,000. Model Cities had fallen behind in allocating its funds to community projects and the word was that they wanted to look at projects in which some funds could be distributed very quickly. The Right Start request included funds to renovate a building in the Hill District, funds for psychological testing equipment, and operating funds for personnel and other resources.

Third, since the proposal was submitted to an agency with a large Board of Commissioners (33), which was linked to several poverty neighborhoods, which were in turn dependent on a multi-layered bureaucracy of local, state, and federal governments each of which had detailed program

---

[22] Jerome Taylor, op. cit.

specifications, the result was that the director and his staff and TCB members became involved in negotiations at many levels. This was not an entirely unforeseen development, but the time required for negotiations was certainly grossly underestimated by all who were involved with the project. This is a problem common to every endeavor which is dependent on money outside of regular departmental or agency budgets. The Summer of 1970 saw the frustration and delay of best-laid plans and gave rise to a series of crises on a regular (quarterly, and even monthly) basis.

The proposal to Model Cities was originally expected to be approved by the end of the Summer of 1970. By July, it was clear to the director that a proposal to Model Cities was going to be a complicated matter and alternative funds were in order.

The University

In January, a director was hired for the newly-funded University-Urban Interface Program. The first priority of this program was in the area of minority and community services.[23] It had been originally conceived that some of the funds from this grant would underwrite the Office of Urban Community Services. However, the director of OUCS felt strongly that the work of this office must be financed out of the regular University budget to insure continuity and flexibility. It became evident after many discussions between OUCS and UUIP staff that the "minorities service" aspects of UUIP would have to develop alternative means of meeting its commitments to the Office of Education. The alter-

---

[23] A. C. Van Dusen, "Proposal to Develop a University-Urban Interface Program, Phase I, Final Report," (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh, November, 1969).

native that evolved was to designate "Outreach Projects" in which UUIP would attach research modules to interface programs working in the area of minority services. OUCS suggested that Project Right Start was in need of program implementation funds.

At a meeting held in June, UUIP presented to the directors of OUCS and Project Right Start an outline of the problem areas of particular interest to UUIP. These problems were related to (1) assessment of community needs and organization; (2) matching available University resources to community needs; and (3) assuring continuity of program support after implementation.[24] The Right Start director's amenability to the research aspect of the project and his setting out of the contingencies[25] involved in each of the areas led UUIP to select Right Start as part of its "Operation Outreach." Thirty thousand dollars were allocated to Right Start at this time, which allowed the Right Start director to hire seven paraprofessionals to be trained in working with infancy and early childhood problems.

Project Right Start - Hiring of Paraprofessionals

Hiring paraprofessionals for the project took place in late September, 1970. The procedure for hiring staff was determined by a special TCB subcommittee in consultation with the director.[26] Eight poverty neighborhood CAP offices were contacted to solicit applications for the positions. At a general TCB membership meeting, applicant criteria were reviewed and and names of possible candidates were also solicited from TCB. From

---

[24] Robert C. Brictson, "Memo to UUIP Staff," spelling out the research criteria for UUIP (for Outreach Projects), July 20, 1970.

[25] Jerome Taylor, "Memo to R. C. Brictson," September 21, 1970.

[26] Jerome Taylor, "Memo to R. C. Brictson: Progress Report on Hill District Center for Primary Prevention," December 11, 1970.

more than 50 inquiries, 25 applicants were scheduled for interviews. The task force that conducted the interviews consisted of two clinical psychologists, a graduate student from the University, and seven TCB members as community participants.

The interview procedure was divided into four parts. The first part was conducted in an informal social format by two TCB members. Its purpose was to assess the applicant's "street level" modes of relating with parents. In the second part each applicant was interviewed by a committee of four TCB members. The purpose of this part was to assess the applicant's commitment to the project, to the community, and to the work involved in training preparation. In the third part of the interview procedure, each applicant was interviewed alone by the Project Director who was interested in reviewing the applicant's past work experience and involvement with children and in assessing the applicant's global cognitive and emotional experience. Finally, each applicant was observed during play with a group of children, some of whom were physically handicapped, many of whom were difficult to manage.

At the end of the day, the interviewers drew up their individual lists of candidates in order of preference. In conference, the three lists were compared, and seven top candidates were selected. All seven candidates accepted the job offer from TCB-Project Right Start.

Summary

By the end of 1970, TCB had become an ongoing community organization which was working closely with University personnel to create a center providing mental health care for infants and the very young. Three University units, UUIP, OUCS, and the Psychology Department--were now directly involved in working with TCB to implement the plans for such a

center. A fourth University unit, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, maintained its involvement through Hill Team members who were also members of TCB and through professionals who were called upon for consultation. One major problem stood in the way of putting the plans into operation in the Hill District: Finances. Such an undertaking would take major financial commitment and by the end of 1970 there was still no final word from Model Cities.

1971

A great deal of the history of Project Right Start in 1971 can be summarized by the words "finding money." The project found itself embedded in the national situation of tight money for welfare projects, social science research, and higher education. The effects of this situation were intensified by an apparent over caution within the bureaucracies of funding agencies, even when there were resources available.

Project Right Start - Funds

Because of the delay in a Model Cities' decision on the proposal, UUIP extended its funding of the paraprofessionals to April 30. This allowed the paraprofessionals to continue their training and gave the director and TCB time to prepare a revised proposal to Model Cities.[27] The Project Right Start proposal was on the agenda of the Model Cities' Commissioners' Meeting in March, and TCB worked energetically to personally contact each commissioner. TCB and the Right Start staff distributed a two-page question and answer sheet to the neighborhoods through the CAP offices. Local community support was also given by the United Black Front and Hill House. Evidence of strong community support for the

---

[27]Jerome Taylor, "Proposal to Model Cities, Revised," March 25, 1970.

project was very necessary because the local Model Cities was generally antagonistic toward University-involved projects. The proposal was given a favorable recommendation by the commissioners and was sent to other levels of the Model Cities' bureaucracies.

While waiting for Model Cities' monies to become available, other sources of funding were sought to carry the project in the interim period. A grant of $15,000 was awarded to Right Start by P.A.C.E. (Program to Aid Citizen Enterprise). The support from this community agency was encouraging because the chairman is the Majority Leader of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and a respected leader of the local black community. A request was also submitted to F.A.N.N. (Fund to Aid Neighborhoods in Need, Catholic Diocese) in July, and within two weeks that request was answered with a $4,000 grant. The P.A.C.E. and F.A.N.N. grants were extremely important because the UUIP support of staff salaries terminated in April and these interim grants allowed some continuity.

In June, the local Model Cities agency acquired a new director and began a period of reorganization. The fate of the substantial Right Start request appeared questionable and other sources of major funding were again explored.

A request for Title IV funds ($32,000) was submitted through United Family Services in August and shortly approved, but a signed contract was not received until January of 1972.[28] Much of the staff salary budget was carried by a University "loan." UUIP renewed support in August, funding one paraprofessional who acts as the special research liason between UUIP and Project Right Start. Late in 1971, Model Cities approved a grant

---

[28] Title IV money has a welfare emphasis and funds projects such as foster homes and day care, rather than direct mental health facilities. Therefore, the name "Primary Prevention Center" was changed to "Right Start", to emphasize the welfare aspects of the project.

of $50,000 to the project. By the end of the year, there were signs that some funds would be available to pursue the plan to move into facilities in the Hill District, but the large scale plans described in the Model Cities proposal seemed more distant than the previous year's expectations predicted.

Right Start - Paraprofessional Training

Training the seven paraprofessionals began in October, 1970. The training takes place mostly within a seminar structure coordinated by the director and involving all staff, some faculty, and TCB members. There are three training components: (1) film presentations and discussions, once per week, which require no special preparation but do require effort to integrate prior learnings with film content; (2) workshops, once per month, which bring in prominent people whose experience and research in early development has relevance to the project's goals; and (3) seminars, three times per week, which require extensive reading and preparation and sometimes written assignments. Within the context of these learning experiences, an effort is made to examine research findings as they are applicable to the paracultural setting of the center.

After almost a year of training, the paraprofessional staff began to apply their child development knowledge to children living in the Hill District. Most of the contact with the children and their parents takes place in the home. Additionally, the CAP agency and the Carnegie Library makes free space available for group sessions and individual assessments. The project director and staff and TCB still have plans to operate their own center, but the plans depend on obtaining sufficient

funds to acquire and renovate a building and the equipment of carry out the work with infants and young children.

The University

The University's programs to explore ways to work with the urban community suffered the constraints of funding that other aspects of education were suffering. UUIP continued its funding of Project Right Start, but on a much reduced basis. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences did lend the Right Start project money to carry it over until monies from outside the University might be made available. The Psychology Department allotted more space and some office furniture to the project. But in general the support could be characterized as "moral" rather than "substantive."

The Urban Community

Although much of the community interaction of 1971 seemed to relate to solicitation of funds, other important aspects of this activity should be recognized. TCB and Project Right Start gained visibility in the community. Local churches, service agencies, and individual residents became interested in the idea of a center to focus on the infant and young child and local community support of the project increased.

Summary of 1971

By the end of 1971 those involved in Project Right Start could look back on a year in which a great deal of experience was gained, both in terms of learning about the local community and learning about how a child might be helped to reach his full potential. The merging of academic knowledge and community need was still far short of its potential, mainly because of the lack of financial resources to put the plan into action.

1972

During 1972, Project Right Start formed a working arrangement with the County Mental Health-Mental Retardation Program to provide a solid financial basis for Project Right Start. PRS hired four new trainees, allowing the expansion of the work with young children.

Project Right Start--Funds

Model Cities' commissioners voted to issue a grant to Project Right Start, but the money was never received. Title IV monies for 1972 were contracted through United Family Services, amounting to $112,000. The County Mental Health-Mental Retardation, the Catholic Diocese, and P.A.C.E. served as the 25 per cent matching fund source. The relationship with MHMR was further developed so that by 1973 Project Right Start became a County agency, contracting to the University for the professional services of Taylor and his staff. Taylor continues to maintain contact with other sources of funding to allow both for program expansion and to prevent overdependency on any one source of funding for the continuation of the present program.

Project Right Start--The Paraprofessionals

In the Fall, four new trainees were selected from over 100 applicants. Seventy of the applicants were interviewed by a TCB subcommittee and two PRS staff members. Fifteen of these were selected for final interviews with Taylor and TCB members. In November, four finalists, all women, were hired for training.

Five of the original trainees serve as supervisors for the new trainees. These five paraprofessionals, called Team Leaders, handle about 15 cases each, while the new trainees are building toward 20 cases each.

Project Right Start and
The Community Organization for
Taking Care of Business

Announcing New Job Openings for Project Right Start

We are pleased to announce that we are now reviewing applications for the position of Developmental Specialist in Project Right Start. We are looking for those, male and female, who love being with and working with children, who are prepared to engage themselves in an intensive program of training involving readings and written assignment, and who are willing to become involved in the considerable amount of community involvement and home visitations that the job will require.

Project Right Start is concerned with children from conception to three. We have special programs to help develop the black identification of children working with us, strengthen their self-confidence and self-esteem, develop skills in learning and thinking, develop elementary skills in reading, and develop their emotional stability.

There are no formal education requirements; we are interested more in the person than in his credentials. Those who are interested in applying should fill out appropriate applications and return them to the person and address listed on those applications.

If you desire further information, Mr. Eli Thomas should be contacted at 621-3500, either extension 6734 or 6735. Salary is variable, but the base rate is $513.00 per month.

Taylor is still very involved in the training and supervision of the Specialists. Besides two three-hour lecture/discussion sessions per week, he also consults on specific problems involved in the cases. Work has proceeded on the Uniterm system, which serves as the curriculum for training and an aid to handling specific problems. Over 1,000 pages have now been written, which not only codifies existing knowledge about the development of the child from birth to three years old, but adds new knowledge based upon Taylor's experience. Eventually, this material will be published for use in training others directly involved with the young child.

Project Right Start--The Program

Project Right Start moved into the new Hill House facility December 1, 1972. Taylor and two PRS staff members established offices there in addition to their University offices. The Hill House office became the focus of PRS coordination, but the Specialists continued to counsel children and their parents in their homes.

Hill House also provided access to a conference room for staff and community meetings with groups of parents. The space allotted permits selective testing of children, but not at the level desired by PRS. Plans call for future expansion of PRS space so that child evaluation testing can be carried out more extensively.

The new location also facilitated inter-agency referrals and cooperation. By the end of 1972, the PRS Specialists were working in conjunction with Child Welfare on six cases, meeting regularly with the Welfare personnel involved with these clients. Negotiations were begun to work out an arrangement with child welfare to pick up per capita costs for services rendered to their clients.

The University

By the end of 1972, the relationship between Project Right Start and the University had greatly changed from its original operation and plans. As originally conceived, the Psychology Department of the University was to develop a community-based clinic which would meet the needs of children in the Hill District and also serve as an experiential base for students in clinical psychology. Actually, both of these goals were being fulfilled by the end of 1972, but through an organizational arrangement not foreseen in the original stages. Project Right Start is now a County agency, operating as part of this governmental unit, and contracting with the University for services. Taylor's early plans had called for the establishment of community control over the funding, which became unfeasible as Project Right Start became mired in financial problems. The University continued to handle the bookkeeping as PRS began operating as a County agency.

As the PRS Specialists began to expand their case load, so did the clinical program expand their involvement with the Project. Several clinical graduate students are working with the paraprofessionals on aspects of the cases. Seven students are conducting research in relation to PRS. The Psychology Department maintained its moral support throughout the development of the project, but it is apparent that a separate community psychology program would need to be established to assure an integrated academic program related to Right Start and similar community-based enterprises.

The School of Social Work also became officially involved in Project Right Start with the assigning of two undergraduate students to the project. The major responsibility of the two students was to work with TCB and although there were several problems involved in this specific

arrangement, another linkage with a University school had been established.

Other sources of University support came in the form of individual help for specific projects. Most noteworthy was the contribution made by several University people to a TCB board training workshop, discussed in the next section.

The Urban Community

It had been originally hoped the PRS would develop with major direction from the neighborhoods it would serve. TCB was involved in the early development of the project, but proved unable to sustain the interest of any sizeable group of community people. During 1972, TCB members did take part in the selection of new PRS trainees, but in general operated in a minimal advisory capacity with PRS. Their chairwoman became extremely busy with other duties and of the 20 official members, only four or five remained really active during the year.

To attempt to overcome their organizational problems, a Board Training Program was set up in the Fall of 1972, to meet for six Monday nights. The topics covered in these sessions included the following:

1. Inter-group relations
2. Board structure
3. Community health services
4. Consultant services
5. Personnel policies
6. Budget policies

The two School of Social Work students were assigned to the meetings to take notes. They did begin to fulfill this function but eventually were asked not to attend the meetings. The meetings were set up to allow

the TCB participants to express their needs as openly as possible and several members felt uncomfortable with the students present at sensitivity sessions.

Dr. Taylor expressed the view that in order to develop a strong community organization, a full-time staff person would be needed to develop the potential of community leadership, much as he had been able to do to develop PRS staff. Although many strong ties have been developed between Project Right Start and established community agencies, a real relationship between people of the neighborhoods and the University is still an unmet goal.

Summary of 1972

The merging of academic knowledge and community needs appears to have found a meeting ground in the form of a government agency. The County Mental Health-Mental Retardation program is now operating Project Right Srart as a part of its local services. This arrangement not only maximizes the project's continuing functioning, but sets up a mechanism for the expansion of the program into other areas of the County.

There are also plans to develop an extended research, programming, and training capability through a federally-funded "institute" in Pediatric Psychology.

The target agency of this case study, Project Right Start, appears to be well on its way to becoming an ongoing institution. However, the second aspect of this study, the institutionalization of relationship between the University and the black community, shows only slow progress towards that goal.

Part III of this study analyzes the processes involved toward institutionalization of Project Right Start as a University-community program.

EVENTS RELEVANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT RIGHT START

	UNIVERSITY		PROJECT RIGHT START (PRS)	URBAN COMMUNITY	
	Administration Policy Events	Psychology Department		Taking Care of Business (TCB)	Other Relevant Elements
1967					
January		Golin's "Self-Esteem" proposal			
June 12	Posvar's speech to N.E.E.D.				
	Western Psychiatric Institute's Hill Team begins operations				Hill Team
November 15	Stone-Van Dusen Report on University activities in community				
1968					
January	University Council on Urban Programs formed	"Project Self-Esteem" begins operations			
April	Black Action Society formed				
	University-Urban Interface Proposal to U.S.O.E.				Martin Luther King, Jr. assassinated and Pittsburgh riots
June	Posvar memo to Schools and Departments requesting inventory of service programs and requesting new racial justice proposals				
	University-Community Educational Programs (U-CEP) started which included "Tri-M", a black scholarship program				
July		Department proposes idea for community psychology center			
		Golin invites Taylor to visit Pittsburgh			
September	Van Dusen sends Golin's proposal to Mellon Foundation for Hill District Extension of Clinical Psychology Center				
December		Mellon Foundation grants $30,000 for development of Hill Extension Psychology Center			
1969					
January		Psychology Department Racial Justice Committee formed to develop policies and standards for recruitment of faculty			
February		Taylor writes letter to Golin about ideas for Hill Extension Psychology Center			
March		Posvar's memo requiring Schools and Departments to specify plans for eradication of racial injustice			

EVENTS RELEVANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT RIGHT START (CONTINUED)

	UNIVERSITY		PROJECT RIGHT START (PRS)	URBAN COMMUNITY	
	Administration Policy Events	Psychology Department		Taking Care of Business (TCB)	Other Relevant Elements
1969					
April	University-Urban Interface Program planning grant from Buhl Foundation and U.S.O.E.				
May	Office of Urban Community Services (OUCS) formed	Taylor hired by Psychology Dept. Mellon Funds pay salary			
July	Director hired for OUCS	Taylor arrives at Pitt and becomes Project Director of Hill Extension Psychology Center			
August-September					Ad Hoc Committee formed by Griffin, a grad student. Task: Information exchange between University and community organizations and programs operating in Hill District
					Hill Team surveys health needs in Hill District
October					Taylor becomes chairman of Ad Hoc Committee. Two members push for development of coalition of "concerned mothers"
November	UUIP sent detailed proposals to U.S.O.E.				
1970					
January	U.S.O.E. approves proposals				
	Director hired for UUIP				
March				Group of "concerned mothers" officially becomes TCB	
				TCB invites Taylor and Baltimore to their meetings	
April	U-CEP begins "New Careers" program	"Proposals for a Community Psychology Center for Child Development sent to private foundations. Request denied by Falk	Project Right Start begins	Taylor and TCB combine efforts and Taylor becomes Director of PRS (linked to TCB)	
May		Proposal sent to Model Cities			
June	Taylor, Bell, and Brictson meet to discuss funding PRS				
	UUIP staff hired				
July 20	UUIP memo to Taylor on research criteria for Outreach Project				
August	UUIP grants $30,000 to PRS for six-month period		TCB becomes involved in "selling" PRS to Model Cities commissioners		

EVENTS RELEVANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT RIGHT START (CONTINUED)

	UNIVERSITY		PROJECT RIGHT START (PRS)	URBAN COMMUNITY	
	Administration Policy Events	Psychology Department		Taking Care of Business (TCB)	Other Relevant Elements
1970					
October			Taylor and TCB recruit and begin to train paraprofessionals		
November			Taylor proposes idea of a "holding company" for PRS Model Cities approval of grant postponed		
1971					
February	UUIP extends grant for PRS for two more months (to April 30)				Hill House agrees to act as "holding company" for PRS
March			Taylor requests funds from PACE and ALCOA	TCB members assist Taylor in "selling" PRS to agencies	Model Cities grant approval postponed
May		Taylor memo on studies in racialism; several academic papers developed in '71; several grad students working with him.	PACE grants $15,000 to PRS		← PACE grants $15,000 to PRS
June					Model Cities has new Director
July	UUIP grants PRS funds to support two half-time paraprofessionals		Taylor requests funds from FANN FANN grants $4,000 to PRS		← FANN grants $4,000 to PRS
			Taylor requests funds from United Family Services (UFS) Title IV		
August	Faculty of Arts & Sciences "lends" some funds to PRS		UFS approves proposal request		
November			UFS (Title IV) grants PRS $32,000		← UFS (Title IV) grants PRS $32,000
			Paraprofessionals begin case work in homes		
December			Model Cities commissioners vote to offer PRS $50,000		← Model Cities grants PRS $50,000; contract not yet signed
1972					
January		Taylor starts Vol. I, Project Right Start	UFS returns signed contract to PRS. OK to use funds	TCB Board has 6-week "board training" workshop	UFS (Title IV) grants $112,000; CMHMR picks up 25% cost-sharing together with FANN and PACE
	School of Social Work Interns	Clinical Psych students work with PRS Specialist; seven graduate research projects	PRS moves into Hill House		
			PRS becomes a County agency		PRS becomes a MHMR County agency
			Four new Specialists join staff for training and to expand caseload		

GLOSSARY OF AGENCIES LINKED TO PROJECT RIGHT START

CAP	Community Action Pittsburgh: A private, non-profit organization which administers all Office of Economic Opportunity funds in Pittsburgh. Project Right Start uses part of CAP's facilities in the Hill District.
CMHMRC	County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center: A center supported by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Comprehensive Mental Health Plan and operated in this catchment area by Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic. It includes in-patient, out-patient, day hospital and home treatment services.
F.A.N.N.	Fund to Aid Neighbors in Need: A community organization program sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh.
Hill House	Organized in 1964 to provide neighborhood development services in the Hill District. Services include child development, ages 3 to 5 years. Funded by United Fund Associations and private grants to special projects. Director of Project Right Start is a Board member. In February, 1971, it agreed to become the "holding company" for Project Right Start.
Hill Team	A group of specialists from Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic in the field of health care and social services who are supported by CMHMRC and concerned specifically with the Hill District. The Hill Team is one of five such teams in the major geographic area assigned to WPIC.
N.E.E.D.	Negro Education Emergency Drive: A national fund-raising organization to provide loans, grants, and scholarships to individual black students for post-high school education in the greater Pittsburgh community.
Model Cities	Model Cities Pittsburgh is funded by Title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. Local control is exercised by 33 appointed and elected commissioners from city government and the poverty community areas. A multi-level bureaucracy connects the local decision-making functions to HUD regional offices.
OUCS	Office of Urban and Community Services: A University-based operation established to serve as a bridge between the University and the community. It was founded to discover and mobilize the University's resources as various problems arose in the urban community which were detected by OUCS "urban action coordinators" who were out in the community.

P.A.C.E.	Program to Aid Citizen Enterprise: A Pittsburgh community organization associated with the Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County. Funds provided by the United Fund. Chairman is prominent black political leader in State House of Representatives. Purpose of P.A.C.E. is to bring community service resources effectively to bear on neighborhood problems.
TCB	Taking Care of Business: A group formed in 1970 which consisted of mothers who were concerned about the lack of services for infants and very young children. They have been intimately involved with Project Right Start both in its beginnings and with its assistance in training and reviewing of Project Right Start staff.
UBF	United Black Front: A federation of Hill District organizations and services to deal with government agencies and other institutions where plans for the Hill District are involved. Established after the 1968 riots to receive and disburse funds for community rehabilitation. Source of funds unknown.
UCEP	University-Community Educational Programs: Provides educational opportunities for the disadvantaged students, especially older students now employed in health, education or welfare fields.
UCUP	University Council on Urban Programs: A committee of University faculty and administrators chosen by Chancellor Posvar in January, 1968, to serve in a policy-making, advisory and coordinating capacity concerning the University's involvement with and commitment to the community.
UFS	United Family Services: Serves as a channel of funds for family services units formerly funded by OEO. Services and funds are provided under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. Services include homemaking, counseling, and supportive services for employment, child care, child rearing, and health needs. Financed by Pennsylvania Public Welfare Funds (75%) and by Community Chest. Operates in eight poverty neighborhoods of Pittsburgh.
WPIC	Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic: An institute operated by the University of Pittsburgh and financed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, grants, and patients' fees.

PART III

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTERFACE BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY THROUGH PROJECT RIGHT START

An Analysis of the Interface Between The University and Community Through Project Right Start

Project Right Start is one of several innovations studied by UUIP with the potential for developing an interface between the University and the community. UUIP was particularly interested in new forms of interfacing which become institutionalized as either on-going programs or as modes of relationships. To facilitate this analysis, the Institution-Building model was applied to the data.[29] This model focuses attention on a set of variables which are considered crucial to analyzing an organization's movement toward institutionalization. The model can be viewed as a matrix with seven basic variables, mapped in three separate perspectives, as follows:

Institution-Building Variables

	Blueprint or Normative Mapping	Actual Operating Mapping	Image Mapping
Goals and Doctrine Programs Leadership Personnel Resources Organization or Internal Structure Linkages			

The first six variables call for data concerning the properties of the program targeted for investigation. A seventh set of variables, linkages, focuses research attention to organizations outside of the target agency, which supply funds, legitimate (both in terms of authority structures and general norms) and in general establish the relationships crucial to an

---

[29] Appendix B further discusses the model and the type of data used to assess each variable.

organization's institutionalization process within the context of a complex larger system. The UUIP staff formulated work sheets which facilitated keeping track of data relevant to each cell of the variable matrix and the time period of a particular state of any of these variables.

Goals

The goals of Project Right Start deal with the "development of prevention approaches and early detection systems that focus on three clusters of child-family behavior".[30] The first two clusters focus on the cognitive learning development and the emotional-personality growth of the child. The third cluster involves interactional structures, such as parent-child, extended family-child, or community-child. The short range goal of Project Right Start was to find the physical space and the personnel to work directly with the child and the family, with the knowledge now available. The overall goals of the target agency never changed from its official birth as the Primary Prevention Center (April, 1970) to its formal institutionalization as a county program. However, the specific goals of focusing on prevention and in very young children developed out of more generalized goals of becoming involved in the problems of low income black neighborhoods.

Even after the goals became more specified, the leadership saw Project Right Start, as it was renamed in the Fall of 1971, as even more than an organization to develop and practice psychological treatment for children. At various times, explicit references were made to such goals as professional training, building University-community reciprocal relations, and developing community leadership. The goals of Project Right

---

[30]Jerome Taylor, from taped UUIP "Outreach Seminar," November 5, 1971.

Start, then, coincide with all three stated University goals: teaching, research, and service. The emphasis in these three general areas varied with the needs of the project and with situational strategies.

The specified goals of Project Right Start emerged out of abstract, general goals discussed in the University and the community. The Chancellor of the University had gone on record in 1967 as committing the University to involvement in urban problems. The assassination of Dr. King in 1968 focused the involvement on the problems of low-income black ghettos. The University Psychology Department formed a Racial Justice Committee early in 1969 with the specific purpose of formulating a policy to recruit more black faculty and students who might be better able to reach into the black community. At the same time, members of the Psychology Department were discussing a plan for an extension of clinical psychology facilities into the ghetto. Such a facility was seen as both a means to train clinicians in ghetto problems and as a way of providing services to the black population of Pittsburgh's Hill District.

During this same period, people in the community, particularly the Community Mental Health Hill Team and the participants in Project Self-Esteem, were gaining experience in community problems and knowledge about current resources which generated new goals for needed community services.

In July of 1969, many goals of the University and the community were brought together by the appointment of Dr. Taylor as a professor in the Department of Psychology with special responsibility to develop a clinical extension center and to work with the Community Health Center Program. The memo reproduced on page 46 illustrates the broad goals encompassed in the early planning which led up to Project Right Start.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

TO: A. C. Van Dusen, Ph.D.

FROM: Sanford Golin, Ph.D.

DATE: May 12, 1969

SUBJECT: Foundation Report

This is in response to your request of May 8, for a statement on the status of the Hill District Extension of the Clinical Psychology Center.

(a) Goals: To develop an extension of the Center to be located in the Hill District, or a similar community. To provide psychological services to children and their families. To provide practicum training for Black graduate students in Clinical Psychology. To relate the Center to other community programs and existing mental health services in the community. To employ nonprofessionals and provide a source for recruitment of Black students for further training in Clinical Psychology. To facilitate increasing the number of Black Ph.D. Clinical Psychologists.

(b) Current Progress: Dr. Jerome Taylor, a Black Clinical Psychologist, has been appointed as Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology, and will join the Department on July 1, 1969. Dr. Taylor is currently Mental Health Director of the Comprehensive Medical Care Project on Children and Youth of the Topeka-Shawnee County Health Department. The development of the extension will be his major responsibility. To date, Dr. Taylor has met with community leaders, the administrative staff of Community Action Pittsburgh, and members of the staff of the Community Mental Health Center of Western Psychiatric Institute to discuss the extension and related matters. Further developments will occur when Dr. Taylor arrives July 1.

(c) Funds: The project is funded for $30,000. for FY 1969. No funds have, therefore, been expended. $15,000 of the funds have been committed for part of Dr. Taylor's salary. The remainder of his salary for FY 1969 is supported through the Community Mental Health Center at WPI, where he will be employed in relating the activities of the extension to the community Mental Health Center programs.

lh

With Dr. Taylor's arrival on the scene, the goals began to take more concrete form. In a report of May, 1970,[31] Dr. Taylor referred to the Department of Psychology's effort to intensify the development of programs "which are relevant to and directly benefit the black inner-city population". In the report he goes on to discuss an original plan to develop an emergency service for children, which had to be reappraised because of lack of sufficient budget to allow for renting space. The available funds were used to explore the existing resources and to develop the goals and program for some form of University-community interface within the basic area of psychology. The May, 1970 report first discusses the many meetings with human services agencies and with parents in the Hill District and with the eventual focus on the problems of very young children. A quotation from the report illustrates both the evolving emphasis on "prevention" and the envisioned relationship with the Psychology Department.

> In summary, there exists the need for a center that concerns itself with clarifying, utilizing, and even developing those "signs" or configurational aspects of behavior which lead towards the establishment of primary and secondary prevention systems and correlated techniques of effective intervention. Service, training, and research would be organized around these ends. Training would prepare paraprofessionals in psychology, who would do much of the testing and assist in all phases of the research, and University students, who would render service through direct involvement and who would contribute to substantive and methodological problems through independent study, masters and doctoral theses. Further, it is hoped that a formal career-ladder subdoctoral program,

---

[31] From J. Taylor to the Mellon Foundation. This report was erroneously directed to Mellon, which was only one of several foundations which had donated a black grant focused on urban problems. These same ideas were also sent to members of the Psychology Department, Racial Justice Committee, February 11 and February 25, 1970.

> comprised of selected clinical experience complemented with meaningful course work developed within the Department of Psychology, can be developed. A subcommittee of the Racial Justice Committee within the Department of Psychology has already been appointed to investigate this latter possibility.

The report concludes by setting out the possible collaboration of the proposed extension center with programs within the Department of Psychology, with the University as a whole, and with universities outside of the Pittsburgh area.

By the Fall of 1970, the goals and the perceived way of implementing these goals had been concretely spelled out in a proposal to Model Cities. This proposal expanded the geographic area to be serviced, because the Model Cities area included Oakland. This expanded territory also implied the inclusion of white children in the serviced population, and made no reference to special problems of the black child. In a letter to the Director of Model Cities, Dr. Taylor especially emphasized the benefit of the project to the communities as a whole in addition to individual children served. The proposal also focused upon the training of paraprofessionals and the use of University expertise, but makes no mention of training experience for professionals. In other words, all three aspects of University goals are included--teaching, research, and service--but the teaching aspect is directed toward indigenous workers rather than University students.

Another example of how the emphasis on the scope of the goals of Project Right Start changed in relation to the source of funds (enabling linkages) being requested was at the point at which the name "Project Right Start" came into use (July, 1971). The Model Cities grant was to

be matched three-to-one with some other monies. A proposal was made for state Title IV funding through Family Services. Title IV grantees were not interested in mental health projects, so the name "Hill District Psychology Center for Primary Prevention" appeared to be a liability in seeking funds from the Title IV source. The new name was not only a "catchier" title, it made the goal easier to translate to the people being served ("get babies off to a good start in life"). The new title also served to keep the planned implementation of the goals ambiguous enough that the needs of particular funding agencies could be taken into account.

The goals of Project Right Start were in response to an ideological commitment of the University to become involved in urban problems and especially in the problems of the low-income black neighborhoods. Several other ideologies also underlay the policy and program implementation of Project Right Start. One such ideology is that the staff working with the people in the neighborhoods should be, as much as possible, from these neighborhoods. The training of indigenous workers became a major activity of the project and will be discussed in the Personnel section of this analysis. It should be pointed out now, however, that this "indigenous" ideology creates a potential conflict with one of the original goals, that of providing field experience for graduate students in clinical psychology. A second ideological stance of importance here was that financial control of the project should be based in the community being served. This aspect will be discussed under Resources.

A third ideological position relates to the way in which the community, and especially its leaders, learn to make use of the University resources. The project began as a joint enterprise of University and community-based

people. The community organization evolving from the group of parents who attended the 1969 discussions with the Hill Team became the focal point for community involvement in Project Right Start. The group took the name "Taking Care of Business" (TCB) (March, 1970), expanded its membership, and in 1971 submitted a proposal for modest funding. This proposal states that "TCB sees itself as an organization that is action-oriented and has determined to not merely promote community awareness to existing problems, but to become actively involved in providing solutions to these problems."[32] Part of the requested funding was to cover leadership training sessions. The proposal states:

> In the organization's effort to become effective has come the realization that the members need technical leadership training to acquire general administrative skills in order to facilitate their objectives.

The leadership of Project Right Start recognized that it was not enough simply to express the doctrine that community groups should have input into or control of programs that effect their lives. If such input or control is to be translated into effective action, certain skills and an understanding of how to make use of available resources has to be acquired. Although the goals of the University and the community may have common elements, the way in which such an interface attempt might be jointly carried out may appear to be quite different depending on whether one is standing on the University end of the interfacing path or the community end. An often-noted characteristic of low-income groups, both black and white, is the absence of participation in formal organization

---

[32] Proposal for the Developmental Phase for the Community Organization of Taking Care of Business, October, 1971.

or an inability to relate to large institutions. In recent years, there has been much activity to attempt to formally organize parts of this population, such as the Welfare Rights Organization, citizen participation on the Model Cities' Commissions, and in the lower-salaried labor force movements. However, most of these attempts have experienced great difficulty in maintaining widespread participation. An added problem has been the lack of trust within the black community toward projects organized by white institutions.

A major concern of Taylor and the Right Start staff was how to support the process of a community group, such as TCB, in working out arrangements with a large institution such as the University, without taking over leadership roles. Taylor stayed away from early TCB meetings in order not to interfere with the development of leadership from within the group. There was also a concerted effort to include TCB members at all stages of Right Start development, such as the choosing of the paraprofessional staff, the meetings with Model Cities, and discussions about program needs. TCB members were also encouraged to broaden the scope of their organization to include more than an interest in Right Start. The TCB members met with University personnel involved in other projects and also concerned themselves with non-University resources. TCB also made arrangements to be incorporated under state laws, which would further assure its autonomy from the University relationships. In the Fall of 1972, a series of workshops were carried out to provide TCB with some special leadership and organization skills (see page 34 of this report). These attempts to develop new patterns of community group's ways of working with the University met with only partial success. Most of the

TCB active members were especially busy in that they held full-time jobs and carried extracurricular civic responsibilities. Some furthered their formal education during this period, and most of the active members benefitted from the experience of working in TCB. However, in terms of the organization itself, there were problems in developing consistent and ongoing leadership which could stimulate growth and coordinate the new group. After about two years of sporadic activity by TCB (which was particularly intense during the Model Cities hearings), Taylor reached the opinion that such groups really need a full-time person that can devote the time to community training that he had devoted to paraprofessional training. Although the ideology of Project Right Start still supports the community involvement, the status of such involvement falls short of earlier expectations. When Project Right Start became an agency of the county, the nature of the community involvement with Right Start changed from the once envisioned control to little more than participation and support. However, the expanded scope of TCB remained as a potential nucleus for leadership in other projects. However, the eventual realization of this leadership potential is an unknown factor.

An assessment of the success of Project Right Start in relation to the goals will be left for the conclusion of this report. To summarize to this point, the specified goals of Project Right Start grew out of ideological commitments of persons in the University and in the community to use available resources for the betterment of people living in low-income neighborhoods and to develop resources to meet problems not currently being met by existing institutions. The goals of Project Right Start were in accord with the general University goals of teaching, research, and service. The goals remained flexible enough to allow for

different emphases of purpose, which were often determined by funding sources to which Project Right Start turned for monies.

A major ideological stance that community people play a role in the development and implementation of the project met with only partial success. Although several active members of TCB contributed a great deal to the project, the community-based organization has not grown beyond a couple of dozen persons and the input into Right Start has not been consistently evident. On the other hand, community-based people are carrying out much of the major program of Right Start, that of the prevention or early detection of potential problems for children.

Program

The blueprint for the Right Start program was specified in great detail in the 1970 proposal to Model Cities (see page 8 of this report). This proposal calls for the services of two types of paraprofessional services (referred to as "generalists" and "specialists") who would be recruited from the neighborhoods being served and specially trained to work with the psychological problems of the young child. Such training became a major part of the program implementation (see page 27 of this report). The training per se became part of the innovative aspects of the project, in that not only did teaching techniques need to be developed, but the content and format of the curriculum was (and is) being developed as the project proceeded.

It had been planned that a center with an ever-growing case load of children would be an actuality during the early training period, so that the new professionals could gain experience with actual cases, under the guidance of trained clinicians. However, slowness in developing the financial base for a physical facility or ongoing staff maintenance

reduced the training and greatly restricted the field experience. In fact, the staff in training had to participate in the development of financial support and development of case load. This led to a certain amount of confusion about the roles of the trainees or the division of function among the staff, the director, and TCB members. However, by 1972, as the financial base became stabilized, five of the original trainees were able to take on supervisory roles (team leaders) in relation to a new group of trainees.

Viewing the program in relation to three categories of goals--teaching, research, and service--it appears that all three aspects have been implemented by Project Right Start. Although the teaching aspect has focused on the training of paraprofessionals, many students from the Psychology Department have also been involved in the project. Some of the originally-hired staff have enrolled in regular University courses. Several graduate students in the Department have developed special projects related to Right Start cases with the Right Start staff.

Besides the research-oriented special projects of the graduate students, the development of the curriculum (the Uniterm system, see page 32) represents a major piece of academic research. It is hoped that this material will be ready in the near future for national distribution. Plans have also been discussed for an institute to train personnel in child development using the experience gained in the development of the system.

Opposition or confusion related to Right Start often stemmed more from program specifics rather than overall goals. Although most people might agree that "helping little children" was a good thing to do, the way one defines "helping" can create a fertile ground for battle. This

researcher, for example, found herself challenging the director at one point as to how "sex appropriate behavior", which was listed in a brochure as one area of concern, might be defined. Such questions illustrate the problem a director must face in deciding how program specfic to be when communicating about the services of a program. On one hand, being too specific opens the door to constant conflicts which can expend energy needed to carry out the service. However, if not enough is known about the service, the perspective consumer will not understand the service, some people will grow suspicious of the unknown, and the program image will be so blurred that needed support could be impaired. This last point is illustrated by a conversation with a Model Cities Commissioner who confused Right Start with another child-oriented project. The specifics of the projects were so unclear to this person that the weaknesses of the other project were attributed to Right Start.

The most successful aspects of Project Right Start, from a University point of view, would appear to be those which evolved naturally from the types of activity that academicians are trained to carry out--teaching and research. Implementing the other goals has been more difficult from a University base. Most academicians have had less experience in organizing community support, in working with political bodies, or even in defining new roles for academic departments. Even though University spokesmen may voice their commitment for University public service, the allocation of funds, the priorities of faculty and students, and even their own expertise often work against the establishment of public service activity.

Leadership

There was sometimes confusion about the leadership of Project Right Start because of the joint role the University and the community were to play in the project. Although the University had hired Dr. Taylor as a professor with special responsibilities to work in the community, there was no comparable community position, a community organizer with special responsibility to work with the University. Although Taylor and the other University staff were committed to the ideology of community leadership in the project, the realities of the situation constantly tipped the balance toward University-based leadership. In the first place, although the community people could talk about the problems, it was usually University people who were trained to offer the solutions. Also, the earliest tasks needed academic skills such as program conceptualization and the writing of formal proposals to funding agencies. Another crucial task in developing the project was training a staff to carry out clinical activity. Again, this called for highly-trained University personnel. The community leadership not only served on a voluntary basis, outside of regular occupations, but most had had little experience in dealing with large institutions. Many TCB members were part of or related to the Mental Health Hill Team, and there was both overlapping and confusion as to their Team role, their TCB role, and their relationship to Project Right Start. The TCB members were also getting advice from such organizations as United Family Service and from some other University-based consultants which probably added to the confusion as to leadership roles in Project Right Start.

For the first two years of the project, the major base of operations was located in a University building, which encouraged emphasis on the

University-based leadership. As the program implementation, and eventually the physical location of the offices, moved out to the community, this emphasis changed. However, it would appear that as the project becomes established as an ongoing county agency, focused on the clinical aspects of the program, the role of community people will be more as supporters and clientele builders rather than organizing and policy leaders.

The lack of adequate resources probably served to strengthen Dr. Taylor's leadership role. Although Taylor at times expressed his frustrations at having to spend so much of his time in developing funding resources and in activity which can be classified as political, in the long run these activities gave him a much more thorough knowledge of the larger community of Pittsburgh and of the local area the project was to directly serve. A more affluent and orderly situation might have limited his perspective to the training and practice aspects, which would have restricted his first-hand knowledge of the community. However, making this a planned strategy can be risky, unless the designated leader has fairly special attributes. The director of Right Start also carried normal faculty responsibilities, such as course work, student guidance, and endless committee meetings. Taylor appears to be blessed with not only an inordinate amount of academic knowledge, but also patience, little need for rest, and a special sensitivity for listening to community people. Without this kind of leadership potential, if a University program fails to allocate adequate funds and make special faculty provisions to support the innovation to at least a stage of reasonable assessment, it is probably doomed to early extinction.

Personnel

Five kinds of personnel can be distinguished in Project Right Start: the paraprofessionals or trainees, the University students, the faculty, secretaries, and TCB members. If an outsider walked into an office when all five categories of the personnel were together, it would be difficult to label which category was which. Indeed, there has been a certain blurring of roles in all except the faculty. Moreover, probably some in the other four categories will eventually become faculty. Part of the blurring of roles is due to the fact that several people were actually involved in more than one of the roles--secretaries and TCB members were students, some original trainees enrolled in regular classes, and graduate students were involved in many of the project activities. Faculty and TCB members worked together to screen trainee applicants, and everyone worked to gain community support during the Model Cities hearings and to discuss other potential funding. Probably the most evident conflict among the personnel was in the division between research and service activity. When the program was focused on more academic activity, there were complaints of no real service action; when the emphasis moved in the other direction, there were concerns about action without knowledge.

Resources

Private foundations supplied the original seed money for Project Right Start. The memo to University official from the Psychology Department (see page 46) says "No funds have, therefore, been expended". This can be interpreted as saying, "the University has not had to use its regular budget monies for the project". This tells a great deal about the problems facing a public service-oriented project based in the University. Many such enterprises undertaken during this period were financed by

governmental agencies or private foundations. This not only has complicated the relationships between projects and the University, but has added financial insecurity to the other woes. Of course, funding on University budget allocations, "hard" money, is not an assurance of financial security, but it does add the criteria that the merits of continuation will also be judged on how a project contributes to the missions of higher education.

The director has said that he would not have accepted the offer if he had known that any part of his salary would come out of "soft" money. Subsequently, he has been put on the regular payroll. Major problems from a faculty point of view in using outside money for professional-level personnel is the tenuous position of an appointee if the funds are withdrawn, the appointees' relationships to the tenure stream, and an often unspoken inference that such a person is not "really a part of the faculty".

The University was supportive of Project Right Start by increasing space allotments and making loans to the project. Taylor makes note of this increased support in a September, 1970, memo:

> First, within the period of approximately one year, our project has moved from a single office to two partially-portioned offices to a suite of offices. This space, allocated by the Department of Psychology and the Dean, indicates the commitment of the University to underwrite and encourage our efforts and suggests the vested confidence they have placed in our project thus far. Second, in our hour of financial crisis, the Chairman of the Department of Psychology and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences made an offer of partial interim funding (which we later found out we did not need to use) and the Office of Urban and Community Services gave extensive consultation and help in locating potential funding resources. Both responses suggest that we have been successful in gaining intradepartmental and administrative support for our efforts.[33]

---

[33] Dr. Jerome Taylor, Memo, September, 1970.

The director found, though, that an inordinate amount of his and the staff and TCB's time was taken in finding money for the project. The conceptualization of a fairly grandiose undertaking early in the project's history grew out of the encouragement of many people to seek Model Cities funds. At one point, the director was advised that the Pittsburgh Model Cities Program had large amounts of money to "get rid of" rather quickly and Right Start submitted a proposal for $600,000, to include facilities, equipment, and personnel. No such grant was ever made, and after surviving on small grants from several sources, Right Start found a home as an agency of the County Mental Health and Mental Retardation programs, housed in a new services center of the Hill District.

Until 1972, when the Right Start project was moving toward governmental status, the director had supported keeping control of funding in the hands of the community being served. The plans called for a "holding company", which would be outside of the formal University structure and outside of the structure of Project Right Start, to act as paymaster and accountant. The rationale for such an arrangement is that, too often, low resource groups have been made to feel like guinea pigs in an experiment, or receivers of charity from kindly benefactors. Thus, control of funds within some neighborhood agency might help to foster a sense of personal involvement in local community projects.

The community "holding company" concept brings up some interesting problems for a university. For example, if the funds cover academic research, how will research directors and the University accounting staff react to the prospect of having financial control of research funds placed in the community rather than the University. The University (as a whole and department by department) has not only used such grants as a status

symbol, but has used the funds as a University resource. Although Taylor got support for the plan from his department chairman and University administrators, it was never put into effect and these questions cannot be answered by experience with an actual situation.

The resource problem in University-community projects is not only the inadequacy of the resources but a kind of "identity crisis" as to whole project it is. Project Right Start was initially housed in University space, used University furniture and equipment, and maintained its operation with funds channeled through the University. And yet, Right Start was trying to develop as a community facility--for and by the community. The brochures that went to agencies and the neighborhoods stress the community control (pages 65-66). The University is mentioned as one of several funding sources and the stated address is not identified as a University building. This strategy has many assets. Many lower-income blacks appear hesitant to "invade" University facilities. Other groups, such as Model Cities, have been suspicious of or outright hostile to University-sponsored activities. An official of a university in another city said his university took the position that people don't want to be reminded how much they owe the university. "We don't rub their noses in their debt. And besides, universities create problems, too, not just solve them."

Internal Structure

The blueprint for Project Right Start calls for a director of the services, consultants, staff to carry out clinical activity, and clerical personnel. In fact, as was pointed out in the Personnel section of this report, all persons involved found themselves in many overlapping functions throughout the development of the agency.

The organizational structure became primarily identified with the director, who was the focal point for tying together academic aspects of the project with community application. Much of the structure evolved from the necessities brought about for relationships with many external organizations, which are discussed under "Linkages".

Linkages

The Institution-Building model calls for looking at several categories of linkages between a target agency and external organizations. Generally speaking, linkages can be defined as "the interdependencies which exist between an institution and other relevant parts of the society." (Esman, 1966) In the case of a small budget, newly developing project such as Project Right Start, the agency was almost completely dependent on resources outside of its internal organization.

The first category of linkages suggested by the I-B model are "enabling". These enabling linkages refer to the bodies of power who control the allocation of authority or resources needed by an agency to perform its functions. The planning phase of Right Start was funded by a block grant from several private foundations. The block grant concept itself added confusion in the early phases of the project in terms of accountability. The director of Right Start submitted a progress report to the Mellon Foundation, which he had understood had provided the funds. Mellon claimed no special responsibility for the project, referring accountability to University officials, who had accepted the seed money from several foundations. Therefore, a linkage which Right Start thought it might establish failed to materialize. The original plans to financially establish the Right Start program called for major federal funding,

either through the locally-channeled Model Cities funds or another federal agency. When the Model Cities proposal became bogged down in bureaucratic problems, it was decided to request interim funds from local sources rather than submit a proposal to a federal agency. This decision was partially based on the need to apply some of the director's and staff's time to building the program, rather than in meeting the complicated guidelines for federal proposals.

As the chronicle shows, several local community sources did provide funds (PACE, FANN, UFS). UUIP monies allowed the director to proceed in the hiring of the paraprofessionals so that their intensive training could begin. Other University funds were made as loans to carry the project until major funding was forthcoming, and Psychology Department resources also provided an enabling linkage. The Title IV funds from the state opened the door for a firm relation with United Family Services and the eventual establishment of Right Start as a County Mental Health-Mental Retardation program. The funding history of Right Start provides an example of the need to have not only strong enabling linkages in terms of University authority (which certainly encouraged the project) but also financial support. This is a crucial problem which universities must face. Every indication points to the shrinkage of University financial resources, and great care must be taken to not encourage interface activities without some real effort toward assuring a financial foundation. Right Start overcame these problems through careful cultivation of financial resources and community support. A more controversial project or one with weaker ties to black leaders (both within and outside of the University) would probably not have had the successful outcome of Project Right Start.

Functional linkages are those with "organizations performing functions and services which are complementary in a production sense, which supply the inputs and which use the outputs of the institution". (Esman, 1972:24) It is this type of linkage which can draw the cry, "You are standing on my territory" if great care is not taken to communicate the contribution which a new service can make to, and not in place of, existing services.

The Right Start plans call for both direct practice and referral to other community agencies. Right Start has worked closely with mental health agencies, public welfare, hospitals, and Family Service. A pamphlet that was sent to local agencies describes the services in rather general ways (see pages 65-66). An emphasis is put on the need to begin thinking about a child's future at the time of conception and that a whole community should be involved in and benefit from programs to develop mentally healthy children. Under a section of the pamphlet entitled "Who Runs It?", focus is directed toward the community control of the service. The University of Pittsburgh is given credit, but in the middle of the paragraph. The linkages are given in such a way as to assure community input and support but also to give the assurance that well-establish institutions, such as the University and the state and federal government, also support Right Start.

The pamphlet that was distributed to the target neighborhoods (a source of "input" in the form of potential clients) focuses on the need for a place to come for help with babies and makes no mention of any other organization. The address, Langley Hall, is not named as a University building. The strategy would appear to be based on the idea that the general public is basically concerned with what an agency can offer them, but that other agencies need to be assured of the legitimacy

(For Agencies)

WHAT IS PROJECT RIGHT START?

It is a program to give our babies and very young children a right start in life. Its purposes are to prevent the development of learning, social and emotional problems and to lessen these problems where they exist. To accomplish our goals, we will work with children from conception to three and with their parents, grandparents, and neighborhoods.

WHY CONCEPTION TO THREE?

From the moment of conception, the way the mother feels about herself and her baby, her man, her circumstances, and her family affects the way the baby grows inside. This is why the period of pregnancy is so important, and this is why we will work with pregnant mothers.

From birth to three, the roots of self-determination and self-respect begin to branch and take hold. The child develops trust and self-confidence and begins to integrate his self-esteem and sexual identity. Project Right Start will help parents and grandparents facilitate these developments and will work with neighborhoods and the community to support the child's growth.

WHAT SERVICES ARE OFFERED?

Project Right Start offers direct services to residents of the Hill District. We will work with expectant mothers and with parents having children from birth to three. Also, we will work with grandparents and other extended family members. In addition to direct service, we offer workshops and informal rap sessions around issues of infancy and child development. Consultation services and training will be offered to community groups and agencies in the remaining target neighborhoods.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

At this time, low income residents of the Hill District are eligible.

WHO RUNS IT?

Project Right Start was started by and will continue to operate under the input of and the eventual control by the Community Organization for T(aking) C(are) of B(usiness). At the moment we are being funded by the program to aid Citizen Enterprise, the Fund to Aid Neighbors in Need, The University of Pittsburgh, and a United States Office of Education block grant made to the University of Pittsburgh. A Title IV grant has been awarded through United Family Service, Inc.

Mrs. Gloria Patterson is the chairman of TCB and Dr. Jerome Taylor is the director of Project Right Start. We have a full time staff of nine community based Developmental Specialists. In addition, the Project has the benefit of five Consultants who are experienced in the areas of child and family development.

Sponsored by

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
for
T(AKING) C(ARE) OF B(USINESS)

Chairman, Mrs. Gloria Patterson

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Vice Chairman, Winifred Smith

Corresponding Secretary
Verna Bowens

Recording Secretary
Irma Woodson

Treasurer
Carol Williams

Project Right Start For Child Development

Our Babies,
Our Families,
Our Future

Jerome Taylor, Ph. D.,
Project Director

Langley Hall, Room 234-A
Tennyson Street at Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Phone number: 621-3500
Ext. 6734, 6735

and territorial boundaries of a service. This strategy appears to work well in that clients have come to Right Start directly from the neighborhoods and through agency referral. However, the establishment of good linkage relationships entailed development of personal contacts. Information pamphlets were only used as an additional piece of communication.

Right Start's functional linkages with the University were maintained because the director not only carried out a service mission for the University, but because teaching and research functions were incorporated as a vital part of Right Start. Teaching and research functions were performed within the boundaries of the project in graduate courses, Psychology Department committees, and in child development research publications.

The "normative linkages" are with institutions which incorporate norms and values (positive or negative) which are relevant to the doctrine and program of the institution". (Esman, 1972:8)

This type of linkage basically overlaps, in the case of Right Start, with the organizations that supplied the funds and performed related functions in the community. TCB was especially important in the building of an image of concordance between community and Right Start values. Another organization which added an important linkage at this point was the United Black Front. A federation of local organizations established after the 1968 riots to coordinate the rehabilitation of the Hill District, UBF became an important source of community support and made efforts to facilitate Right Start's search for physical space and financing.

Project Right Start remained fairly invisible outside of the target communities. There were very few articles in the public press or use of other public media to gain wide support. The establishing of linkages was

concentrated on direct personal contact with relevant funding agencies and with those relevant to the target neighborhoods. In the language of the Institution-Building model, very few diffuse linkages were established. This relative lack of visibility carried over to the University itself, where, with few exceptions (UUIP, OUCS, Psychology, and a few in related services) the purpose of, or even the name, Right Start was unknown.

Summary and Conclusions

Institutionalization of Project Right Start can be viewed on two levels. The first focuses on the specific goal of setting up a center to develop preventative approaches and early detection devices in the area of child development. Right Start did bring together and train a staff which is now working directly with families in the Hill District. The project is currently (1973) established in a new community service center in the Hill District. A major part of the financial base will be supplied by, or channeled through, Allegheny County. This will allow the Right Start staff to concentrate on program building rather than program financial survival. Every indication is that Right Start has been institutionalized as an ongoing service, and as a county agency may expand beyond its present target area.

At another level, institutionalization focuses on the modes of relationship between the University and the minority community. Project Right Start initiated or encouraged many activities to build an interaction pattern between these two entities which would encourage better communication. The Director of Right Start was sensitive to the differences in forms of interaction which are characteristic of these two bodies. The University has traditionally offered the services of experts

who not only knew the substantive content of a problem area, but were adept at organization and in making use of available resources. Minority community leaders, on the other hand, were aware of vital needs and anxious to solve problems, but usually lacked the skills to conceptualize the solutions or administer complex organizations. Therefore, the University would find itself in a situation where its personnel was virtually running new programs.

Project Right Start did not completely break from this pattern. The necessity for submitting technical research proposals and for training new professionals focused leadership activity on the director. Even though community people were willing to give their time, there were many aspects of the program building which they were unable to carry out without further training. The workshops conducted for TCB board members was initiated to help these community people in administrative skills, but these were conducted after Right Start was substantially organized. A word of caution needs to be expressed toward the development of community training workshops. Community people should not have to accept the burden of learning "University ways" in order to communicate and form viable working relations with the University. Some traditional interaction patterns of low economic communities (such as face-to-face communication systems and loosely-knit organization forms) may complement the relationships between the University and minority neighborhoods and should not be discouraged when community leaders are trained to make use of University resources.

For the TCB members, Right Start served as a valuable experience in dealing first-hand with complex organizational problems, but not in taking major responsibility for building a financial base or an administrative

structure to carry out the functions of the agency. To reiterate the opinion of Dr. Taylor, in order to insure real minority community control of its services, intensive training would need to be conducted in financial and organization management.

The successful training of indigenous workers in gaining the skills for the clinical practice aspect of Right Start adds evidence that such training can bring positive results. Most of the original trainees now carry supervisory responsibility over new personnel and are capable of making sound decisions in the context of their occupation. If the project had had another person at Taylor's level of expertise to concomitantly give management training to the TCB members, Right Start may have been institutionalized as a private, local agency (although the financially chaotic welfare scene might have worked against this under any circumstances). However, TCB members now stand as a nucleus of minority community members who have experience and some administrative skill training to serve as a catalyst for future community organization.

Although the style of leadership had an effect on the internal structure of Right Start and on the relationships with external organizations, in the long run the crucial factor was the willingness of the leadership to devote time and energy to building the program. The director of this project had to play several roles--the teacher, the director of program, and the research entrepreneur. The combining of these roles has become prevalent in recent years as institutions of higher education have encouraged their faculties to become involved in more research and social policy activities. Because a large portion of the funds for such activity have come from sources outside of the regular University budget, the research professor has had to learn to seek and manage monies in the way of a private entrepreneur. And because so many of the social action programs in

which universities become involved are also external to the regular organizational structure of the University, the faculty has had to acquire management skills not heretofore demanded by classroom-focused activities. It is possible to combine these roles in one person; however, if the University is going to encourage this kind of activity, more resources will have to be included in a project budget for leadership backup. The most obvious need is for the addition of full-time administrative assistants who can handle paper work such as budget management, appointment arrangements, progress report expediting, and so forth. Although Right Start had personnel to assist the director in these management activities, these personnel were also carrying out several roles, such as secretary, student, and program implementor, and were learning management skills on-the-job.

The continuity of Right Start has been assured for at least the near future by the linkage established with the county government. Setting up program headquarters in a centrally-located service facility in the Hill District should assure access to clients, both directly and through other agency referrals. This location also makes Right Start an integral part of the community it serves. The University will undoubtedly continue its relationship to Project Right Start, as a valuable resource for the development of theory and practice techniques in helping disadvantaged children become emotionally healthy adults.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

1. History.

Although the University of Pittsburgh claims 1787 as its founding date, it was only in recent years that it presumed to be anything more than a local and somewhat parochial commuter college. In 1955, however, the placid pace and untroubled stance at Pitt began to give way before a spirit of dramatic and far-reaching change. This was at a time when the "Pittsburgh Renaissance" was determinedly reshaping and upgrading the downtown business area. Now the University's Board of Trustees (which included some of the nation's wealthiest men who were the main backers of the "renaissance") announced new goals which, when realized, would "place the University of Pittsburgh among the leaders of the world's great universities."

The man selected by the trustees to provide over this transformation was Edward H. Litchfield, then dean of Cornell University's School of Business and Public Administration, active on the boards of several large corporations, president of the Governmental Affairs Institute in Washington, and executive director of the American Political Science Association. With Litchfield's appointment as Chancellor there began a decade of change, expansion and innovation at the University which is now referred to, in retrospect, as the "Litchfield Era."

This era ended rather abruptly in 1965. It was an era that had not exactly created another "leader among the world's great universities"out of a commuter college. It had, however, elevated the university's admission standards, doubled its faculty and tripled its physical plant. The university had become "good" in many departments, at least "very good" in others, and had attracted both prestigeous faculty and promising graduate students. It had also accumulated nearly $20 million in deficits and had been, at least temporarily, disowned by the power structure that had both declared and endorsed its aspirations.*

The financial crisis of 1965 forced the University to seek aid from the state legislature. In 1966 Pitt became one of Pennsylvania's three large state related private universities. A state-related status means that although the University remains under private control it must give the State minority representation on its Board of Trustees. In return, the State subsidizes a low tuition for Pennsylvania residents and underwrites a portion of the overhead expenses of the University. In 1972 state support accounted for approximately 30% of the University's income.

State-related status has placed several other responsibilities --both explicit and implied--upon the University of Pittsburgh. One explicit

---

* For a more complete account, see D.S. Greenberg, "Pittsburgh: The Rocky Road to Academic Excellence," Science, Vol. 151, February, 1966.

responsibility is that of increasing the proportion of students enrolled in its upperclass undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. An implicit added responsibility is to serve not only those who enroll in these programs but also the community and the people of the Commonwealth. Thus, while Chancellor Wesley W. Posvar, in his Report of the Chancellor for 1972, pledges that there will be no shift in emphasis from fundamental scholarship to more applied "service-oriented" activities, he calls for the addition of an "urban dimension to the intellectually rigorous, high-quality approaches of traditional scholarship."

The body of this report is a description, analysis and evaluation of some of the University's efforts in this dimension.

2. Enrollment

The University's enrollment in Fall 1971-72 was 31,708, of which approximately half (15,263) represented full-time undergraduates. Of the balance, 6,876 were part-time undergraduates, 5,044 were full-time post-baccalaureate students, and 4,525 were part-time post-baccalaureates. Student's at Pitt's regional campuses accounted for 2,931 of the full-time undergraduate total and 1,249 of the part-time undergraduate total. All graduate students were registered at the main (Oakland) campus.

These figures compare with a total enrollment of approximately 17,500 in 1965-66, the year before Pitt became a state-related institution. The estimated enrollment for 1972-73 is down slightly from the 1971-72 peak, reflecting a national trend.

Degrees conferred in the year ending June 30,1972 totaled 6,879, of which slightly better than half (3,608) were bachelor degrees. There were 2,526 Masters degrees conferred, 372 First Professional degrees (Dental Medicine, Law, Medicine) and 373 Doctorates.

3. Administration

The thirty-six-member Board of Trustees is composed of twelve Commonwealth appointees and twenty-four elected members. Four ex-officio members include the Chancellor of the University, the Governor of the Commonwealth, the Secretary of Education of the Commonwealth, and the Mayor of the City of Pittsburgh.

The Chancellor is assisted by the Provost, the chief academic officer of the University, and by four Vice Chancellors responsible for the Health Professions, Finance, Student Affairs, and Program Development and Public Affairs.

The major academic units of the University, with the exception of those in the Health Professions, fall within the purview of the office of the Provost. These include the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and its undergraduate College; the schools of Engineering, Education, Law, Social Work and General Studies; the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, Business, and Library and Information Sciences; the University's

Regional Campuses at Johnstown, Greensburg, Titusville, and Bradford; and a number of University Centers and Divisions, including the University Center for International Studies, the Learning Research and Development Center, the University Center for Urban Research, University-Community Educational Programs, and the Inter-disciplinary Program in Information Science.

University libraries, the Computer Center, and the Knowledge Availabilities Systems Center, which also report to the Provost, are under the supervision of the Director of Communications Programs. The University Press is under the administrative direction of the Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs.

The Director of Athletics and the Dean of Student Affairs report directly to the Chancellor.

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for the Health Professions is responsible for the University's six Schools of the Health Professions--Dental Medicine, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Health-Related Professions, and the Graduate School of Public Health.

The Office also coordinates the educational programs of the University with the delivery of health care services in the University Health Center of Pittsburgh. The University Health Center is a separate corporation composed of Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, Magee-Women's Hospital, Montefiore Hospital, Presbyterian-University Hospital, and the University of Pittsburgh. The faculties of the Schools of the Health Professions constitute the professional staffs of these hospitals. The Vice Chancellor serves as president and chief administrative officer of the University Health Center and the Associate Vice Chancellor serves as its secretary.

In addition, the University has affiliation agreements for clinical teaching in the Veterans Administration Hospital, Mercy Hospital, West Penn Hospital, and Allegheny General Hospital. Western Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, a comprehensive psychiatric facility, functions as an integral part of the University and is also administered through the office of the Vice Chancellor for the Health Professions.

APPENDIX B

The Use of the Institution-Building Model for University-Urban Interface Research

An overall research framework was deemed necessary for the UUIP research in order to compare findings across program areas and to pull the many pieces of separate research projects into an integrated whole.

The UUIP research staff's decision to use the institution-building framework was based on three major assets of the model. (1) The assumptions and theorems underlying the model are compatible with the philosophy of the University-Urban Interface Program. (2) The variables focused upon in the model are of a universal nature and can be applied to the varied projects which UUIP was assessing. And (3), several of the original developers of the institution-building model are associated with the University of Pittsburgh and were available for consultation.

The Assumptions of the Institution-Building Model

An institution, such as the University of Pittsburgh, is established to fulfill needs of a society. When an institution no longer fulfills the needs adequately or is challenged to fulfill additional needs not heretofore undertaken, new ways or innovations are developed to meet those needs. How the University can respond to the demands for more involvement in the plight of the city was the subject of UUIP research. Although there were many demands for leadership roles for University involvement, the majority seemed to feel the University should work <u>with</u> the community not <u>for</u> the community. This is the explicit philosophy behind the I-B model.

> This concept of development assistance represents a clear-cut break with the concept of charity which involves a quite different approach to help-giving.Charity was a strong element in the precursors of modern development administration - the missionaries. Many of them went abroad primarily to do good deeds, while meeting their need to save the souls of persons whom they regarded as less fortunate... ...in return for acceptance of their creed, missionaries were willing to give gifts in resources, skills, ...Modern aid ...is given to a social system.....by development of new organizations which can perform innovative functions affect-many people. (Eaton,1972:139)

In UUIP research efforts, the University is viewed as a resource rather than a charitable organization.

Innovative efforts can be developed within the existing institution or planned outside of the institution. These innovative activities may become passing fads or may be "institutionized", either in the form of some new organization or as a routine way of operating within the parent institution. The institution-building (I-B) model focuses on the elements of organizational process that must be considered when introducing a planned change into a system.

> While I-B is not a universal model of social change, it does apply to innumerable situations in contemporary societies in which (1) change agents, usually enjoying some measure of offical sponsorship...impress their goals .....on society; (2) ....the proposed innovation must be induced ...not coerced; (3) formal organizations are employed as the media or vehicles through which change agents develop the technical capacities and the normative commitment needed to guide, sustain, and protect the intended innovations. (Esman in Eaton, 1972:25)

The model has been largely applied to change in underdeveloped countries. However, the generic nature of the major variables of the model make it a useful model for the guidance or study of more established institutions. This use of the model has, to the present, been largely untapped. The model also has been considered more for guidance of social planners and practitioners of change rather than those standing apart to monitor an attempted change. The UUIP research staff decided, however, that the utility of the model in , at the least, aiding the systematizing of copious data being amassed in its project could outweigh the lack of experience in using the model to analyze induced change in an established American institution and for purely research purposes.

> A principle theorem of institution building is that new service programs are most likely to become adopted .... when they are a part of an organized or patterned way of doing things ....(Eaton, 1972:139)

This institutionalization aspect of planned innovations was of particular interest to the UUIP research focus, and led to application of the I-B model as a framework for the project. Some of the research questions were (1) what kind of innovative programs introduced within the University became a part of accepted University patterns of activity; (2) what appears to make the difference in the success or failure of a project; (3) and what is the relationship between a university-based project and the community with which it interacts?

Nehnevajsa gives the following tests of institutionality: (Eaton, 1972:14)

> (1) An organization's ability to survive.
>
> (2) Extent to which an innovative organization comes to be viewed by its environment to have intrinsic value, to be measured operationally be such indices as its degree of autonomy and its influence on other institutions.
>
> (3) The extent to which an innovative pattern in the new organization becomes normative for other social units in the larger social system.

None of the innovative programs which were studied by UUIP had specifically set out to use the I-B model as a guide for organization building. The use of the I-B model for UUIP research, then, becomes one of applying the concepts for an analysis of the programs, apart from any role in the implementation of those programs.

The Variables of the Model

The model focuses on seven basic issues in the development of an institution: the goals and doctrines; the programs; leadership; personnel; resources; organization or internal structure; and linkages with the external environment.* Each of these issues is viewed from three perspectives or mappings. The "blueprint" mapping focuses on the plans as stated in organization charts, budgets, program specifications, or stated goals. The second mapping, operations, calls for data concerning what is actually happening as the attempt is made to carry out the blueprints. The third focus is "image" mapping, which looks at the perceptions that relevant constituencies have about the seven issues. The emphasis on the three mappings make the I-B model especially useful for UUIP research because the purpose was to find out not only what the University is doing in terms of university-community relations, but how people perceive that university action.

*There are several variations of the institution-building model and most of the recent discussions subsume "personnel" under resources or internal structure. However, UUIP research found it more useful to consider personnel as a separate issue.

Institution-Building Variables

	Blueprint or Normative Mapping	Actual Operating Mapping	Image Mapping
Goals and Doctrine			
Programs			
Leadership			
Personnel			
Resources			
Organization or Internal Structure			
Linkages			

The first six variables call for data concerning the properties of the program which is the target of the investigation. Each of these six variables call for three types of mapping. The UUIP staff formulated work sheets which facilitated keeping track of data relevant to each cell of the variable matrix and the time period of a particular state of any of these variables. (see next page)

The first row deals with data about the goals and doctrine of the innovative programs. This data for the blueprint mapping was usually available through the goal specifications stated in a funding proposal or in a brochure or other official hand-out paper which gave the purpose of the organization. These same documents also usually yielded statements which gave clues as to the ideology supporting the program. The cell calling for "actual goal" was used for information about aspects of the goal being implemented as indicated by resource allocation, statements by program implementors, or in progress reports. The images of the goal were assessed by interviews of persons both within and outside of the program.

The leadership of a program has been shown to be crucial in many studies of development. The blueprint mapping used by UUIP was often taken from job descriptions or by interviews of those with the authority to hire a new director. The research staff's assessment of the personality characteristics of a leader was included as part of the operations mapping; this information was gathered through direct observation or through interpretation of events. Other people's view of the particular leader was considered image mapping.

Although the I-B model often includes "personnel" as part of the "resources", for the university setting the analysis of personnel was more useful as a separate category. For example, several of the projects studied trained paraprofessionals and graduate students. The relations between these two types of personnel was often central to program problems needing solution. Also, the divisions in perceptions of university roles between administrators, faculty, students, alumni, trustees, and other publics was more than a resource related situation.

The program itself was described in proposals of offical memoranda, but often upon participant observation was different than the blueprint. Most of the image mapping for these program variables consisted of state-

INSTITUTION BUILDING WORK SHEET

Area of Description: _____ Name: _____

Time of Description: _____ Date Written: _____

		Blueprint or Normative Mapping	Actual Operating Mapping	Image Mapping
1	Specified Goals			
	Ideological Doctrine			
2	Programs			
3	Leadership			
4	Personnel			
5	Resources			
6	Organization or Internal Structure			

ments from "outsiders" as to what they thought the program was doing.

The resource categories were heavily laden with funding data, as this became the crucial problem in most of the UUIP observed programs. However, the apparent priority given a program by the University was also assessed through the kind and amount of space and materials allotted to a program.

The internal structure of a project proved to be particularly complex to follow because formal organization charts were not only out of date, but rarely reflected actual practice or informal networks. Because all of the UUIP projects were interacting with many University departments and community groups, the organization was complex, often experimental and ever-changing. Much of the decision-making and implementation was done through informal processes which were very difficult to trace.

The linkages are a major thrust of the I-B model and of UUIP research.

> Change agents must both (a) build technically viable and socially effective organizations which can be vehicles for innovation, and (b) manage relationships (linkages) with other groups on whom they depend for complementaries and support and whose behavior they are attempting to influence. Building viable organizations and managing their linkages are closely interrelated aspects of a single institution-building process. (Esman in Eaton, 1972:25)

In order to begin to understand the effect of these community relations on the institutionalization of any program, the nature and history of the linkages between program and the larger University and those outside of the University became of paramount concern.

The I-B model distinguishes between four types of linkages. Each of the types describes a kind of relationship between the target program and external organizations or groups.

Enabling linkages refer to those bodies which have control over the program in the form of allocation of resources and decision-making authority which directly relate to the facilitation of the program. In UUIP research this type of linkage includes funding agencies, the Chancellor's office, and often, in a less direct way, state and federal policy makers.

The functional linkages include those which constrain or support project activity, such as departmental faculty, neighborhood organizations, and competing programs. Katz describes this type of linkage as "encompassing the flows of resources and products necessary for carrying on the systems activities ...". (Eaton, 1972:157)

The normative linkages deal with values, such as what do certain constituencies expect of the University and the specific programs; what roles are compatible with accepted customs; what constraints are placed upon the institution by laws? Some of this type of data was gathered through surveys of University groups, alumni, and the general public. Other material was gathered through image mapping data which implied accepted norms and values.

The diffuse linkages include the many other sources of support of opposition which may not be directly linked to the program but nevertheless have an impact. This category would include the local news media and public opinion information. Diffuse linkages often served as the miscellaneous category when an item did not seem to really fit in one of the other definitions.

The research task requires identification of specific patterns of interdependence. With the identification of linkages, consideration must then be given to the actual and possible impacts which change in the linkage relationships might make upon the institution building process. A final task is to determine the impact which intra-organizational adaptations might have upon the nature of the linkages. (Nehnevajsa, n.d.)

Discussion with I-B Developers

Joseph Eaton and Jiri Nehnevajsa, two of the original developers of the I-B model, conducted a seminar with the UUIP staff. An all day session was also held with the directors and liaison personnel of the Outreach projects to discuss particular issues involved in the use of the model.

All sessions were taped. A re-ordered transcript of one of these sessions with the I-B consultants is presented here to illustrate the nature of the discussions and some of the methodological problems that the staff had to resolve.

DISCUSSION ABOUT INSTITUTION-BUILDING

taken from UUIP Consultant Seminar

of October 22, 1971

The following pieces of discussion are paraphrases and reordering of material taken from a taped seminar with Jiri Nehnevajsa.

Goals:

Q: You may have a nice neat set of goals originally, but when you look again many things have changed. You have to find out what went on between two mappings.

A: (PS) That varies, too. Some projects start with very inexplicit plans.

JN: That's a very important opportunity for analysis--to see what happens under varying degrees of specificity, of definitions of roles. (Refers to paper by Fred Bruhns which examines changing goals under varying conditions of leadership and where some categories are developed for this purpose. Study was part of institution-building program. Focused on evolution of goals.)

Q: How do we classify the Master Plan for campus expansion? Is it at the blueprint or operations level?

A: (JN) The plan is the goal at the normative level. The evolution of the plan ceases to be interesting except to the extent to which at the level of the operations it may enter in when people complain about not having been in on the making of the Master Plan--the politics of its history. The cutting points are when you decide to enter the process, this is necessarily somewhat arbitrary.

Q: Moore's project represents two sets of goals, i.e., basic research objectives and alleviating social problems, which may be difficult to fulfill in the same program. How to treat this?

A: (JN) This happens quite often. Organizations pursue incompatible objectives. For example, universities in many countries want simultaneously to pursue the advancement of knowledge and the promotion of citizenship, i.e., the feeling "my country, right or wrong." Something may have to give, perhaps depending on leadership. Sometimes allocation of resources will tell you which priorities are actually being pursued. The actual program permits you to make inferences about the goals and whatever discrepancies exist.

Leadership:

Q: Leadership seems to cross-cut several levels--

A: (JN) You have to look at leadership as you move out into individual projects as it is constituted at that level--the people responsible for making decisions for that project. Then people at general UUIP level become links (or linkages) to that project. Leadership is identified in the formal structure--at the blueprint level at least--although there may be influentials behind the formal structure, and this goes into what is actually happening.

Q: Talks of newly-appointed provost and how she has to more or less carve out her own role so that in that process emphasis on categories shifts as she develops her niche.

A: (JN) Yes, and if she should leave, one would expect shifts again in terms of a new interaction set. It's very tricky to decide just exactly how often to monitor the process.

Linkages:

JN: Enabling most clear--collectivities or entities, very frequently in government, who by their actions, at the blueprint level, found or undo programs and projects. At some levels, there are no such linkages. Top government, for example, has none except for sporadic outbursts of voting.

Functional linkages are all the things you need to do your job. Not only physical resources but such things as information, directives, recommendations, questions.

Q: These inputs--related to decision-making--are very difficult to get.

JN: At any point, you can use only what information is available. Some of this will be loose, not clearly defined. Memoranda do not reflect what goes on because they are public documents whereas what goes on is reality.

Normative linkages involve organizations which may be indirectly involved but whose norms and values have some influence on the functioning of an organization. Almost always there are general taboos or mores of a culture which through their organizational embodiments such as churches may be supporting or contradicting.

Diffuse linkages--no direct authority of any kind but who exist in environment and whose views may effect organizational functioning by display of support or withdrawal, e.g., mass media or public opinion. No direct authority at all but may at times have some bearing.

Q: I was thinking that normative linkages are manifested through diffuse linkages, but one kind may be manifested through traditions of University?

A: (JH) Yes, that is one kind.

Q: What about People's Oakland, which exerts influence only through a value of citizens' rights? No real power except a few votes. There may be many normative linkages of this type, and it seems as if together they constitute a whole set which is the diffuse linkages.

JH: The important thing is it isn't necessary to place a given organization into only one of these boxes because it may in its different activities have several bearings of different kinds. For example, commonwealth government is enabling but also is providing various resources and services, so it is also functional. Rather than worrying about how to label linkages, we take the black box in which there are the leadership, programs, and so on, but notice that there are some things which go in at the input level, and certain products which go out of it. What goes in are messages and people and resources. Messages include: (1) directives from those in higher positions with which compliance is expected; (2) recommendations which might or might not be followed, e.g., Research Advisory Council; (3) questions which must be paid attention to; and (4) data, information about things in which you are interested, people flowing in who are personnel and leaders and in some organizations like the University, people are also processed, that is, something is being done to them. Resources plant, equipment, materials, money coming in from different sources. What happens when these inputs are not available in the right amount, at the right time, etc.? Impact on the project differs with type of inputs as well as sheer amounts. Every organization also produces something--at the goal level it has certain things it wants to do. Products also are messages, people and sometimes resources, e.g., consumer goods. These kinds of data are what is needed. The most important products of your work are reports. Many researchers had problems with these linkages. Unless a taxonomy facilitates something it should not be used so if these are difficult, if one worries too much, "where should I put this," it is not helpful. Some work has to be done to clarify linkage concepts. The main thing is to be aware of linkages, collect all the relevant data, and not worry at this point about precise classifications.

Q: There seem to be both external and internal types of linkages. Besides those with other organizations, there must be those between, say, leadership and personnel in the same organization.

JH: That's right, it depends on the point of reference. If we are standing outside this box which represents a project, we think of inputs and outputs. But internally, of course, there is also a process of communication, a pattern through which information flows, and is somehow diffused through internal structure. That is correct, but it may not be useful to use the term linkages for that also.

Q: All Outreach Projects represent some kind of interface between the University and some group out in the community, which is as important a box as what is coming out for University.

JN: Of course, there is no reason why after you have looked at this box and identified these boxes around it in terms of input and output, you cannot make another box and make it the center of a new diagram, because the things you are doing to some community organization are only one of the things that happen to it. There are other inputs that flow into it, and it produces certain things. This is the way of really defining a social system if you have the time and energy. The meaning of the system concept is the interdependence of parts.

Q: Where do we stop? This process of diagramming linkage boxes could go on indefinitely.

JN: If I were you, I would stop at the first level, that is to say, the organization you are studying. The boundary of your observations would be set by the box representing UUIP and its internal composition and inputs and outputs and the same constellation for the Outreach project. It would be ideal with enough money to keep moving outward, but time and resources limit you.

General Problems of Use of Institution-Building

JN: Do not at this stage confound data collection with analysis, that is, do not decide at this stage that this (i.e., leadership role) is the problem. First collect the data. Generating these mappings (work sheets) is like a photograph of an operation at a certain point in time. Life is moving but it is like running a series of photographs at a certain rate of speed. Maybe you have to look at the situation every three months or every six months depending on the dynamics of the particular project.

Q: We will try to fill in data about every month and pull it together every three months. There are problems about outreach data and we probably need some of our own staff to observe and collect additional data.

JN: We tried to convince AID of importance of attaching an observer to each project only to act as continuous reporter, a recorder of facts, the social history of the project, without worrying about what it means. This is a matter for analysis, but just the fact of reporting--this is the only way we are going to learn about how organizations evolve and change and function.

References

Eaton, J. W. (ed.). Institution Building and Development: From Concepts to Application. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1972.

Esman, Milton J. The Institution Building Concepts--An Interim Appraisal. (Inter-University Research Program in Institution Building publication of the Research Center Headquarters, University of Pittsburgh), March, 1967.

Esman, Milton J. and Hans C. Blaise. Institution Building Research: The Guiding Concepts. (Inter-University Research Program in Institution Building publication of the Research Center Headquarters, University of Pittsburgh), February, 1966.

Kilmer, Gary. The SCP in Terms of the Institution Building Model. (unpublished manuscript). University of Pittsburgh, March, 1973.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri. Institution Building: Elements of a Research Orientation. University of Pittsburgh, no date.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri. Methodological Issues in Institution-Building Research. (unpublished working paper), March, 1964.

APPENDIX C

The Research Advisory Council of The University-Urban Interface Program

William Garrison, Professor, School of Engineering

Steele Gow, Dean, Division of Instructional Experimentation and Dean, School of General Studies

Donald Henderson, Associate Provost

Burkart Holzner, Chairman of the Department of Sociology

Lawrence Howard, Professor of Public and International Affairs

Paul Lazarsfeld, University Professor of Sociology

Mauritz Lindvall, Faculty and Research Associate, Learning, Research and Development Center

Jiri Nehnevajsa, Professor, Department of Sociology

Otto Nelson, Consultant to the Office of the Secretary of the University

Allen Pond, Associate Dean, Graduate School of Public Health

John Yeager, Director of University-Wide Planning

APPENDIX D

REPORTS PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY-URBAN INTERFACE PROGRAM*

Official Reports

Proposal to Develop a Program of University-Urban Interface, Phase I, November, 1969. (126 pages)

Proposal for Continuation of a University-Urban Interface Program, December, 1969. (63 pages)

Supplementary Information, March through September, 1970, September, 1970. (31 pages)

Progress Report III, September 1, 1970 to January 1, 1971, January, 1971. (107 pages)

Progress Report IV, January 1, 1971 to March 31, 1971, March, 1971. (35 pages)

Proposal Addendum, Scope of Work for Phases III and IV, May, 1971. (27 pages)

**Phase II, Interim Report (April, 1970-June, 1971), September, 1971. (152 pages; ED 063-902)

Phase III, Progress Report 1 (July-September, 1971), October, 1971. (29 pages)

*Phase III, Progress Report 2 (October-December, 1971), January, 1972. (31 pages)

*Phase III, Progress Report 3 (January-March, 1972), April, 1972. (31 pages)

*Phase III, Progress Report 4 (April-June, 1972), July, 1972. (16 pages)

*Phase IV, Progress Report 1 (July-September, 1972), September, 1972. (17 pages)

*Phase IV, Progress Report 2 (October-December, 1972), December, 1972. (11 pages)

Final Report, June 30, 1973.

---

*Single asterisks indicate reports sent to ERIC for possible circulation; double asterisks indicate those which have already been evaluated and are available through:

ERIC Processing & Reference Facility
4833 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Special Reports

**Research Report of Communications, Phase II, by Barbara Swanson, et. al., June, 1971. (205 pages; ED 066-061)

**The Student Consultant Project (SCP): A Case Study of Student Involvement In Social Action, by Michael S. Koleda and William T. Tiba, September, 1971. (62 pages; ED 063-898)

**The Pittsburgh Goals Study--A Summary, by Jiri Nehnevajsa and Alan Coleman. October, 1971. (15 pages; ED 066-061)

**Pittsburgh Goals: Some Issues, by Jiri Nehnevajsa, October, 1971. (10 pages; ED 065-427)

*Is Conflict Utilization Underestimated?, by M. Coleman, et. al., October, 1971 (University Forum Background Paper). (32 pages)

**Law and Order in the Metropolitan Area: Issues and Options, by Matthew Holden, Jr., November, 1971 (University Forum Background Paper). (56 pages; ED 063-903)

**Pittsburgh Goals: Notes on the Criminal Justice System, by Jiri Nehnevajsa, November, 1971. (9 pages; ED 063-900)

**The University and the Community in the Domain of Health, by W. L. Treuting, et. al., December, 1971 (University Forum Background Paper). (48 pages; ED 065-426)

*Pittsburgh Goals: Some Thoughts on Health Issues, by Jiri Nehnevajsa and Robert C. Brictson, December, 1971. (10 pages)

*Goals and Government of the Metropolis, by J. Steele Gow, February, 1972 (University Forum Background Paper). (28 pages)

*Pittsburgh Goals: Notes on Metropolitanism, by Jiri Nehnevajsa, February, 1972. (9 pages)

**The Impact of the University of Pittsburgh on the Local Economy, by Educational Systems Research Group, April, 1972. (81 pages; ED 063-901)

*A University and Its Community Confront Problems and Goals, by J. Steele Gow and Leslie Salmon-Cox, June, 1972. (75 pages)

Program Development and Public Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh, by Albert C. Van Dusen, July, 1972. (41 pages)

*Methodological Appendix--The Impact of the University of Pittsburgh on the Local Economy, by Educational Systems Research Group, August, 1972. (66 pages)

**University-Urban Interface Program Brochure, April, 1972. (14 pages; ED 063-897)

A Survey of the Alumni of the University of Pittsburgh, by Martha Baum and Barbara Jameson, For the Alumni Association of the University of Pittsburgh, January, 1973. (117 pages)

*Pittsburgh: Goals and Futures, by Jiri Nehnevajsa, February, 1973. (142 pages)

*The General Public Views the University: A Report of Community Interviews, by Barbara Jameson, Ramsey Kleff and Liva Jacoby, March, 1973. (72 pages)

Inter-Group Cooperation and Urban Problem-Solving: Observation on a Community Long-Range Goals Project, by Martha Baum, May, 1973. (98 pages)

Explorations in Experiential Learning, by Michael Sugg, May, 1973. (139 pages)

Truth, Love, and Campus Development, by Paul Shaw, June, 1973. (96 pages)

The Student Consultant Project, by Christina Jarema, June, 1973. (40 pages)

Campus Development--Observers' Reports, edited by Paul Shaw, June, 1973. (60 pages)

The Clarifying Environments Program--A Case Study of a University "Outreach" Project, by Liva Jacoby, June, 1973. (85 pages)

Project Right Start, by Barbara Jameson, June, 1973. (73 pages)

Communication Between the University and Its Publics, by Barbara Jameson, Liva Jacoby and Ramsey Kleff, June, 1973. (55 pages)

University Governance and Community Relations, by Martha Baum, June, 1973. (55 pages)

Papers and Presentations

The University and the City, Presented as part of the Round Table on "The Organization as a 'Transmittal Belt' between the Individual and Society." Seventh World Congress of Sociology, Varna, Bulgaria, by Robert C. Brictson, September, 1970.

Measuring the Impact of College or University on the Local Economy, Workshop for Educational Systems Research Group, Washington, D. C., by Robert C. Brictson, January 1972. See: Urban University Economic Impact: A Prototype Case Study in Pittsburgh, by Robert C. Brictson and George Mowbray. January 17-18, 1972.

University-Urban Interface: Motives, Means and Measures, American Educational Research Association 1972 Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, by Robert C. Brictson and Albert C. Van Dusen, April, 1972.

*University-Urban Interface: Issues, Methodology, Prospects, Presented at Eastern Psychological Association 43rd Annual Meeting, Boston, Mass., by Robert C. Brictson and Albert C. Van Dusen, April, 1972.

*The Urban University Student: A Political Profile, Presented at the Annual Meeting of the District of Columbia Sociological Society, Howard University, Washington, D. C., by Paul Shaw, May, 1972.

*Community Constraints on Academic Planning: Myths and Realities, Prepared for Presentation before the Seventh Annual Conference of the Society for College and University Planning, Atlanta, Georgia, by Paul Shaw and Louis A. Tronzo, August, 1972.

University-Urban Interface Research, Presented for Luncheon Round Table Discussion, American Sociological Association 1972 Annual Meeting, New Orleans, La., by Robert C. Brictson, August, 1972.

Multiple Pressures on University Governance, Presented for Round Table Discussion, American Sociological Association 1972 Annual Meeting, New Orleans, La., by Martha Baum, August, 1972.

*Research on Communiversity Relations, Prepared for the Symposium on Academic Reform of the American Psychological Association - 1973 Annual Meeting, Honolulu, Hawaii, by Albert C. Van Dusen and Robert C. Brictson, September, 1972.

Making--And Using--An Economic Impact Study, Presented as Part of the Seminar on "Research: Foundation for Effective Public Relations," 1973 American College Public Relations Association National Conference, San Diego, Calif., by Robert C. Brictson, July, 1973.